

1941

S.B. 425 (ch. 339) County aid to cities: Streets. Authorizes county aid for street work and ordinance to provide conditions upon which allocation shall be made.

1942

S.B. (ch. 1) Emergencies—war use only: Provided authority to expend funds or use property or personnel to meet any emergency created by war or sabotage.

1944

S.B. 48 (ch. 47) Plans and sites: One of the most farsighted measures ever adopted by our legislature (and initiated by the Senate) granting cities \$10 million to prepare plans and specifications for public works which could not be built during the war but which would be absolutely essential after the war. This was followed in 1946 by a \$90 million matching construction program which, although assembly initiated, was carried over the Governor's veto as a result of Senate leadership. (Incidentally, this was the only override of an Earl Warren veto during the time he was Governor of the State.)

1945

S.B. 586 (ch. 932) Hospital districts: An act desperately needed in the postwar years to provide hospitals in both urban and suburban California.

S.B. 1302 (ch. 1024) Disaster act: An act which still serves as a model for many States in the establishment of a working organization to cope with any type of manmade or natural disaster.

1947

S.B. 1351 (ch. 712) Liquor license fees: Increased the allocation to cities of liquor license fees from 50 percent of gross to 100 percent of the amount actually collected within cities.

S.B. 712 (ch. 777) Gasoline tax: The largest single increase ever made in allocation of gasoline taxes to cities by the State assuming the entire cost of extension of State highways through cities and, in addition, increasing the annual allocation for city street purposes.

S.B. 1593 (ch. 1168) In lieu tax: As indicated above, this is a major source of municipal revenue received without strings where the cities get one-half of the total amount of vehicle license fees which are in lieu of local property taxes on such vehicles.

S.C.A. 14—Ballot Proposition 18 (ch. 173) Reimbursement for tax exempt property.

1949

S.B. 20 (ch. 1147) Separation of grade districts: Facilitating construction of grade separations by areawide financing.

S.B. 246 (ch. 1481) Added sec. 25643 to Gov. C. County structural fire tax: Excepting cities from county structural fire tax, and thereby relieving cities from unfair taxation.

S.B. 851 (ch. 1488) 1941 sewer and sanitation—revenue bond law: Revenue bonds for water. Prior to this time, cities were without authority to construct or expand such essential facilities except through the issuance of general obligation bonds requiring a two-thirds vote. By this time, California was growing at an astonishing rate, and every method of financing including the one listed immediately below had to be utilized. Here again, we find rural recognition of urban needs.

S.C.A. 33 (ch. 195) Pledge of parking meter revenues: To finance acquisition of offstreet parking facilities.

1951

S.B. 282 (ch. 633) Special census: Authorizing special census by cities for gas and in lieu tax purposes.

S.B. 914 (ch. 738) Use tax authority for sixth-class cities: Broadening and diversifying local tax base. This act was essential to

the levy of both sales and use tax by cities and was subsequently followed in 1955 by the Bradley-Burns Act. This latter proposal which was opposed by farmers and agricultural interests now produces in the neighborhood of \$300 million a year for local government. It is the major reason the metropolitan cities of California have been able to meet some but not all of their growth problems.

1953

S.B. 900 (ch. 526) 1941 revenue bond law: To include garbage collection, ferry systems, parking, swimming pools, and terminal facilities within revenue bond financing authority of cities.

S.B. 1100 (ch. 1582) Distribution of fines and forfeitures: Under inferior court reorganization cities are guaranteed no loss of revenue as a result of losing city courts.

S.B. 1159 (did not pass) County and city affairs commission: Showed recognition of metropolitan area problems. Measure would have provided a forum to consider local intergovernmental relations problems.

1955

S.B. 278 (ch. 703) Reimbursement agreements in subdivisions for drainage: Extended sewer financing principle to storm drainage.

S.B. 1268 (ch. 1440) OASI coverage for public employees: Made basic social security coverage available for first time to many city and other public employees.

S.B. 1971 (ch. 1890) Engineering and administration allocation of gas tax: Engineering and administrative allocation of gas tax to cities based on population.

1957

S.B. 1234 (ch. 1696) Urban renewal authority: Very important legislation for metropolitan cities.

S.B. 2208 (ch. 2091) Grade separation: Five million dollars allocated annually to cities from gas tax for grade separation. Construction costs to reduce accident toll from railroad crossing accidents by speeding up construction.

S.B. 933 (ch. 1651) Aircraft operation—zone of approach: Helpful to airport-owning cities in metropolitan areas.

S.B. 244 (ch. 1989) Community mental health act (Short-Doyle Act): A precedent-setting step forward in establishing programs for outpatient care of the mentally disturbed.

S.B. 2175 (ch. 2376) State participation in Federal beach erosion control projects: Helpful to southern beach areas.

S.B. 2110 (ch. 2375) Loans for small craft harbors.

S.B. 2107 (ch. 2362) Small craft harbors division.

1959

S.B. 1461 (ch. 1658) Authorization for acquisition by counties and cities of open spaces: Open space is most needed in and around congested metropolitan areas.

S.B. 703 (ch. 1102) Revision and streamlining of Community Redevelopment Act: The most important urban renewal legislation in California since the act was adopted in 1945.

S.B. 5 (ch. 822) \$750,000 annually to small craft harbor revolving fund: Most municipal small craft harbors are now financed with this fund.

S.B. 931 (ch. 1598) Small Craft Harbor District Act.

S.B. 169 (ch. 2157) Distribution of rentals from State freeway acquisitions to taxing agencies.

S.B. 20 (ch. 6) Extension of ½-cent gas tax (imposed in 1953 and due to expire in 1959). Act enables State to continue with freeway construction program in urban areas.

1961

S.B. 1031 (ch. 1404) Municipal tort liability: Postponed for 2 years the effect of a

California Supreme Court decision making cities liable in all cases where an individual would be liable for negligent acts. Permitted the legislature to consider governmental problems which would arise if liability made government unable to govern.

S.B. 1294 (did not pass) Local option in lieu tax: This measure would have helped cities eliminate several billion dollars of critical street deficiencies. The bill was approved by the senate and defeated by the assembly notwithstanding the fact that 80 percent of the money would have been spent within metropolitan areas.

S.C.A. 26 (did not pass) Telephone gross receipts tax: Would have given cities 1 percent of telephone gross receipts or \$9 million annually. Approved by senate and defeated by assembly.

S.B. 1522 (did not pass) Withdrawal from park and recreation districts: Would have permitted city territory to withdraw from park and recreation districts. It would have eliminated dual taxation on property owners by both district and city when service is provided only by city. Approved by senate and defeated by assembly.

1963

S.B. 344 (ch. 1852) Gasoline tax: This unquestionably was one of the most important measures for metropolitan cities considered during the 30-year period we are covering. City receipts from gasoline taxes were more than doubled and, as a result, critical deficiencies on congested city streets are now being corrected. The measure will produce about \$76 million annually, in addition to revenues already received by local government.

S.B. 42 et seq. (ch. 1681 et seq.) Municipal liability: These bills spell out in detail the nature and extent of municipal tort liability. It would have been impossible to continue to operate municipal jails, police departments, fire departments, and so forth, without such legislation.

In the 1963 session, as well as others, there is no question but that bills beneficial to urban interests were initiated in a house (assembly) districted largely on the basis of population but in every case these measures had to be approved by the senate. This was true of the State water program and the Rumford Fair Housing Act.

In his Legislative Review, dated July 18, 1961, the executive director of the League of California Cities concluded:

"Both offensively and defensively the so-called rural senate and its committees showed more understanding of and sympathy toward bills of interest to cities than did the urban assembly. Contrary to popular belief this is not unusual. This year, more than ever before, the assembly showed an alarming disregard for the principles of home rule and the needs of cities. This is not true of all assemblymen nor is the outstanding senate record true as to all senators but it is a completely accurate statement as to a majority of the members of each house. The proof is in the final history."

On the negative side, we can only state that almost all bills which would infringe on the right of cities to control their own internal affairs originate in the assembly, and where successful, they have been defeated in the senate where there is much greater recognition of the rights of city councils to control their own internal operations. One need only examine measures to decrease the hours of firemen, increase vacation periods of firemen and policemen, preempt certain fields of taxation, preclude local exercise of the police power, and restrict the right of cities to enact their own land use regulations.

A wide variety of tax exemption measures (narrowing both the property and sales and

August 4, 1965

18660

use tax bases which are the principal source of revenue of local government) originate in the assembly. When successful in the assembly, they have been defeated by the senate. There can be no greater threat to urban and metropolitan municipal home rule than to make our cities dependent upon the State for adequate revenues with which to provide a minimum standard of municipal services.

In short, the record is clear that the concentration of power in the State and the regulation of the right of cities to control their own affairs stems from legislators who represent metropolitan areas.

Finally, it should be noted that in the Senate of the State of California, as now constituted, 17 of the 40 senators represent metropolitan areas as listed by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget as standard metropolitan areas. This means that 42 percent of the present senate represents the metropolitan or predominately urban areas of California. Because California has grown so rapidly, senators representing once rural areas now represent heavily populated areas even though their districts have not been changed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Joint Resolution 66, as amended by the Dirksen amendment, as modified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What are we voting on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be voting on Senate Joint Resolution 66 as amended by the Dirksen substitute, as modified.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Joint Resolution 66 as amended by the Dirksen substitute, as modified.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were per-

mitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). In view of the fact that this is a vote on a question which requires a two-thirds vote, I am paired, together with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If the Senator from Minnesota were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent and his pair was previously announced.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is detained on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Aiken	Fong	Mundt
Allott	Fulbright	Murphy
Bartlett	Gruening	Pearson
Bennett	Harris	Prouty
Bible	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Hruska	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cooper	Kuchel	Smathers
Cotton	Lausche	Smith
Curtis	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dirksen	McClellan	Stennis
Dominick	Metcalf	Talmadge
Eastland	Miller	Thurmond
Ellender	Monroney	Tower
Ervin	Morton	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—39

Anderson	Inouye	Morse
Bass	Jackson	Muskie
Bayh	Javits	Nelson
Boggs	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Pell
Case	Magnuson	Proxmire
Clark	McGee	Randolph
Dodd	McGovern	Ribicoff
Douglas	McIntyre	Tydings
Gore	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Mondale	Yarborough
Hartke	Montoya	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—4

Hayden	McCarthy	Symington
Long, La.		

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 57 and the nays 39. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution, as amended, is rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the vote today on the proposed constitutional amendment, was, I believe, a real vote for the American people. It should enable the decisions of the Supreme Court to be carried into effect in the various States. The result will be, I believe, a very healthy increase in the vigor of State legislatures and in the degree of actual representation which they will give to the people.

It should also lead to less dependence upon the Federal Government and more work on the State level.

I thank all those who participated in

the debate. Especially, I wish to single out for praise the two whips, who helped us very materially, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TVINGES]. Their services were above and beyond praise. We are deeply indebted to all those who worked hard and who stood firm amidst the tremendous pressures which were placed upon them.

I also pay tribute to the minority leader, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with whom I differed very sharply on the question before the Senate, but who was not only courteous, but also extremely fair in the allocation of time and in the conduct of the debate.

I thank the majority leader also for his courtesy in the matter.

In short, I believe this has been a good day for the American people.

For the record
VIETNAM—THE IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I said in a speech on the floor of the Senate:

Mr. President, in my trip across the country and back since I spoke on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, I have been alarmed by the rising denunciation of the President and his administration for their Vietnam policy. I have heard the word "impeach" used more often in the last week than I have heard it since President Truman sacked General MacArthur. I have been asked by more people than I would have thought possible if there is not grounds for impeachment of the President, and how the process can be set in motion. I have been advised about petitions that have been circulated and hundreds of people are signing asking for the President's impeachment.

Much of this talk stems from objections to a war being undertaken without congressional declaration. Most of these people see the President as waging an executive war, in violation of the Constitution. They think the impeachment clauses of the Constitution must apply to such a case.

Then I went on to make a statement as to why, in my judgment, Congress should not adjourn sine die but should remain in session until January 1. I pointed out that we should remain in session and carry out our constitutional responsibility of serving as a legislative check upon executive action.

There are those, judging from the interviews with the press today, and from telephone calls that the senior Senator from Oregon has received, who interpret my remarks as indicating that I advocate the impeachment of the President.

Of course, such an interpretation is nonsense.

Mr. President, I have been receiving a great deal of mail in regard to this matter and many people have talked to me at meetings at which I have spoken in opposition to the President's war in Vietnam. I have been answering all of the mail on the impeachment matter with a letter that contains these two paragraphs. I read two paragraphs from a letter dated July 6, 1965. I have sent similar letters before and since that time:

In your letter, you asked me for my views concerning your suggestion that steps should

be taken to impeach President Johnson and perhaps some other officials. It is my view that such an impeachment attempt would be a very serious mistake. All it would do would be to divert attention away from the basic issues involved in American foreign policy in Asia and center attention on President Johnson, as an individual. It would cause many people who disagree with his foreign policy to rally behind him, because they would consider such a movement to be an ad hominem approach. Attacking Johnson, personally, will not change his course of action, and it will not win supporters for a change of foreign policy in Asia, but to the contrary, it will drive supporters away.

In my opinion, there is no question about Johnson's sincerity or his patriotism or his desire for peace. It is Johnson's bad judgment and mistaken reasoning in respect to the war in Asia that constitute the basis of the crucial problems that confront us in trying to get a change in Johnson's policies in Asia. To attack him, personally, by proposing impeachment would be the most serious personal attack that could be made upon him. It would rally the Nation behind him and result in his policies being escalated into a major war at a much faster rate. Those of us who oppose Johnson's foreign policies must meet his views on their merits. We should never attack him, personally.

I wish the RECORD to show that this letter represents the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken in all correspondence on the subject. Also it represents my answers to questions on impeachment at all rallies I have attended, and in all my conversations with those who urge impeachment of the President.

Those that I have talked to and who have written to me suggesting impeachment of the President are not extremists in the sense that they are irresponsible persons. Many of them are on the faculties of American universities. Many of them are out of the professional life of our Nation.

I have no intention of joining them in such a program. Nevertheless, I believe it is a significant fact that there is growing discussion in this country of an attempt to stop the President from his illegal war in southeast Asia, even to the extent of circulating impeachment petitions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe it is indefensible and cruel for any person to talk about impeaching the President of the United States with respect to our part in South Vietnam.

It has just been stated that professors are urging and circulating petitions for the impeachment of the President. What does that mean?

Does that mean that professors of our universities are gifted with infallibility?

The President has tried with all his might to bring about an understanding that would end the shooting and the carnage in South Vietnam. Eleven important measures have been proposed by him, any one of which, if it had been adopted, would have brought to an end the carnage.

With respect to impeaching the President, I have had letters in the last 8 years asking for the impeachment of President Eisenhower and the impeachment of President Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs debacle. Those letters come to us and I do not attach significance to them.

In my judgment, the President of the United States is bogged down by a weight so great that it has never been equal to that imposed upon any ruler in a republic or in a monarchy in the history of the world.

The President of the United States is attempting to carry that burden courageously. He is trying to achieve peace by the proposal of negotiations to the extent that, rather than be attacked on the ground that he does not want peace, he ought to be attacked because he is going too far in surrendering to the opponents of our system of government.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say in reply to the Senator from Ohio that it is not at all surprising for people in the country who think the President is following an unconscionable and illegal course of action in South Vietnam to turn to the Constitution and look for what procedural protection they have. They have a perfect right to turn to the impeachment procedure. I believe that they are making a great mistake in judgment. I, of course, would defend them in their right to exercise their constitutional rights. But, in one sense, I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that until the President follows his constitutional obligation by coming before this body and ask for a declaration of war, the President is engaged in an illegal war. It is a war now conducted by the Chief Executive, in South Vietnam without a scintilla of constitutional right. This Congress is likewise guilty of violating its duties under the Constitution by seeking to delegate to the President a power that it cannot constitutionally delegate. It is the duty of the Congress under article I, section 8, either to declare war or to stop the President from slaughtering American boys in southeast Asia. I have no doubt that impeachment talk will increase if the President continues to conduct an unconstitutional war.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have had no letters asking for the impeachment of President Johnson; I have had a thousand letters asking for the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren. I have disregarded the latter. I think we ought not to be talking about impeaching the President of the United States.

On the face of the President's effort to achieve peace and the preservation of our country and his courageous handling of a most difficult challenge to our security, we should not speak of impeaching but rather helping the President in the solution of a backbreaking problem that no individual ought to carry.

The President needs and is entitled to help, but not to the cruel and shameful threat of impeachment.

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COUNCIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 511, Senate bill 944.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 944) to provide for expanded research

in the oceans and the Great Lakes to establish a National Oceanographic Council and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of August 2, 1965, pp. 18272-18275, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I urge Senators to remain in the Chamber so that we may expedite action on the pending question if it is at all possible.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the conferees on the voting rights bill have, following some six meetings, reported what I believe can be described as a strong bill.

There would be 100 versions of this bill, I assume, if each of us were a czar, but I believe the conference recommendation will be regarded as an effective bill and one which will bear the test of time well.

There were really two significant disagreements and attention-gathering features of the bill. I believe it fair to say, on both of these, that the Senate position is reflected in the conference report.

The section on American-flag schools, the so-called treatment of Puerto Ricans, is as the Senate adopted it.

The treatment of the poll tax, I believe, fairly could be said to be substantially as the Senate adopted the provision. The conferees on the part of the House sought very strongly to retain—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator withhold?

The Senator is entitled to the consideration of the Senate. This is a very important matter. The Chair asks those in the rear of the Chamber to please refrain from conversation and find themselves comfortable chairs. If they cannot, please exit.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. HART. It will be recalled that the House of Representatives treated the poll tax by outlawing it.

August 4, 1965

We made a finding that both the 14th and 15th amendments appeared to be abused and breached, and directed that the Attorney General promptly file suit in such cases. This is the approach agreed on in conference.

Additionally, provision was made for the payment of poll taxes during the pendency of the judicial decisions, in the event decision had not been reached within 45 days of any election.

Perhaps the third most significant item of disagreement is what we in this Chamber know as the Long amendment.

Here provision is made for a county which enrolls at least 50 percent of the nonwhite eligible to come to the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia, make a presentation satisfactory to the court that more than 50 percent are enrolled, and that no discriminatory practices are being engaged in. On that showing and finding by the court, the examiners, if any have been appointed, are removed.

The conference report additionally requires, as the Senate bill did, that if a court finds that a test or device has been abused in any jurisdiction under section 3, it shall suspend all tests and devices in that jurisdiction.

Additionally, the so-called triggering provision of the legislation reflects the House approach.

We provided that if less than 50 percent of those eligible in a State or political subdivision voted last November, and at least 20 percent of the population was not white, a suspension of the tests and devices would apply.

The 20-percent limitation was dropped in the conference, and tests and devices are suspended upon a showing of less than 50 percent voting.

The sanctions of the bill, the protections of the bill, are extended to those who aid and assist others in seeking to register and vote, thus protecting any registration drive that might occur.

The provision that was added by the Senate seeking to make automatic the introduction of examiners in an area without tests or devices where less than 25 percent of the nonwhites have registered—and I regret to say this—was eliminated by the conferees.

Section 18 of the Senate bill was dropped since it was related specifically to the State of Arkansas, where particular problems arose as a result of the 25-percent trigger provision of the Senate bill and a complete new registration requirement under the Arkansas constitution.

The Senate, in passing the bill, permitted the Attorney General to require, in his discretion, that anyone seeking to register with a Federal examiner first go to a local examiner and allege that he had been denied. This provision was dropped.

Further, we suggested as desirable, though did not direct or require, that examiners be selected from persons resident in the political unit in which they would serve. This is not embodied in the conference report.

The reach of the bill is extended to the selection of party officers, as the House version provided.

The voting title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is amended to extend to State and local elections.

As is always the case, there were disappointments, I am sure, on the part of both groups of conferees. I repeat, however, that it is our feeling that the bill as developed by the committee of conference represents an adequate, effective response to a problem which, if left unresolved much longer, could bring disaster on us all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I voice my appreciation of the action of the conferees in standing, as they apparently did, rigidly back of the verdict of the Senate, although by a close vote, against any approach to a repeal of local and State poll taxes by way of Federal statute. I realize that the conferees were of varying convictions upon that subject. But the expression of the Senate was quite clear on that subject, and I congratulate the conferees upon having stood their ground on this matter.

Also—and I am not saying this entirely facetiously—I believe the distinguished conferees have saved themselves and the Senate a good bit of time by taking that very correct and loyal position. I thank the Senator from Michigan for having in that respect stood sturdily by the expression of the Senate, which he was standing for and representing in conference.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Florida, who recognizes that in this particular instance the position that we as conferees took did not happen to represent the position I took when the subject was before the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask whether the conference report omits the provision that the military would be counted in Alaska.

Mr. HART. It is my impression that there is no disagreement.

Mr. GRUENING. How does that leave us? We in Alaska thought it unfair to discriminate against Alaskans in that respect.

Mr. HART. The bill remains as the Senate passed it. It is my impression that this provision was not in disagreement and therefore this rules out a matter before the conferees.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. First, I commend the Senator from Michigan for his able work in the conference, and particularly for preserving the Senate version with respect to false registration. I refer the Senator to section 11(c), on page 7 of the conference report, the so-called clean elections amendment which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I sponsored. I notice that a slight change has been made in conference in the wording of the language as passed by the Senate. I refer the Senator from Michigan to the proviso:

Provided, however, That this provision shall be applicable only to general, special, or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the United States Senate, Member of the United States House of Representatives, or Delegates or Commissioners from the territories or possessions, or Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Do I correctly understand the meaning of this provision to be that if there is to be an election, let us say, for Governor of a State, or for State legislators, and also, at the same time, there is to be an election for a Member of Congress, this provision would apply due to the "in part" language that was provided by the conferees?

Mr. HART. The impression or interpretation voiced by the Senator from Iowa is the understanding of the conferees. I should explain that this is what we knew as the Williams of Delaware amendment. It was added as an amendment offered by Representative CRAMER to the House bill. The conference has consolidated this language as a fair summary of the two versions. Except for technical variations, I believe it represents the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Michigan. He is correct. The conferees retained the Williams amendment which was cosponsored by Senator MILLER, Senator MURPHY, and Senator SIMPSON. With the possible exception of a grammatical change, it is the amendment exactly as adopted unanimously by the Senate. I am delighted that it was included in both the House bill and the Senate bill. This was the so-called clean elections amendment.

For the first time, we shall now have spelled out in the Federal law that penalties are applicable to anyone who willfully gives false information to a registrar for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to vote. This is a highly important section of the bill. While we subscribe to the right of every person to vote, we want to make certain that when he votes he casts a legal ballot and that his vote is properly counted.

Likewise, this amendment makes it a Federal crime for anyone to pay or offer to pay any individual either to register or to cast a vote and the same penalty applies to anyone who accepts such payment for voting.

This penalty is applicable in any election where the name of a candidate for a Federal office is on the ballot. This is an important part of the bill. I am delighted that it has been retained by the conferees. This new provision should help us to promote cleaner elections.

Mr. HART. It was certainly our intention to preserve it as the Senator from Delaware intended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 11(c), which was the so-called Williams amendment, be printed at this point in the RECORD. This amendment

point of challenging the constitutional right of the Federal Government to intervene at all.

"One of the most delicate and vexing social, economic and legal situations," Mr. Stein observed in starting the Cleveland hearing, "is to have one instrumentality of government telling another what to do, when the other one may not be ready to do it. It presents some very awkward problems."

Mr. Stein, a lawyer, copes with these problems by radiating amiability, soft-pedaling the compulsory nature of the proceedings, and resolving contretemps with casual remarks that end in a disarming chuckle.

"We're dealing with facts subject to scientific measurements," is his watchword. "Once we get agreement on the facts, the solutions will present themselves."

He lets off steam at afterhours cocktail and dinner gatherings with associates, punctuating these sessions with such exclamations as, "We're certainly getting a lot of jazz from the so-and-so people," or "Did you hear what that son of a gun from XYZ Co. had the nerve to claim?"

The net result of his onstage tact has been that in 34 enforcement cases to date, only one has reached the point of court proceedings. All have produced remedial programs, and in about a dozen cases, pollution has been ended or significantly reduced.

A FEDERAL CAREER MAN

Mr. Stein has had only one employer in his life, the U.S. Government. He was born in the East New York section of Brooklyn on October 17, 1916, the son of a food broker. He graduated from Thomas Jefferson High School and studied for 2 years at the College of the City of New York before seeking his fortune in Washington.

There, he worked as a printer's devil in the Government Printing Office, served as an Army medical technician during World War II and worked as a clerk in the Federal Security Agency's law office while studying law at George Washington University. On getting his degree, with honors, in 1949, he joined the staff of the security agency's general counsel.

Since then he has dealt with most of the many health activities that are now under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, ranging from vital statistics, home accidents and poultry sanitation to radiation hazards, shell fish sanitation and mental health.

He has been enforcement chief of the public health service's division of Water Supply and Pollution Control since the present pollution control law was passed in 1956.

Mr. Stein and his wife, the former Anne Kopelman, also of Brooklyn, have two teenage daughters. His hobbies are hiking and surf-swimming. He has no middle name.

The Steins live in Fairfax County, Va., in a conservative modern home. As one who spends most of his time prodding authorities all over the country into installing modern sewage treatment systems, Mr. Stein confesses somewhat sheepishly that his own residence is served by a well and a septic tank. But, he says, "we do have indoor plumbing."

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Mr. Max Freedman, a recognized master of English prose, provided what I think may very well be the most beautiful tribute to the late Adlai Stevenson.

I ask unanimous consent that this masterful article from the Washington Evening Star of July 15, 1965, entitled "The Greatness of Adlai Stevenson," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 15, 1965]

THE GREATNESS OF ADLAI STEVENSON (By Max Freedman)

By the grace of his spirit and the splendor of his mind Adlai Stevenson turned the sting of defeat into a crown of glory. He earned more honor in misfortune, than most leaders gain in victory. He lost two elections, but he never lost the pride of his party or the admiration of his country. That garland can never wither, nor can time stain the radiance of his enduring renown.

In 1952, without his choosing, he took charge of a party divided by many quarrels and uncertain of its future. He gave it a fighting faith once more by making it confident of its purpose and destiny. That was his first great achievement.

Then he fought a campaign with the shining weapons of wit and eloquence and scholarship, never once picking up a dirty bludgeon or falling below the level of his own high theme. There had been nothing like it since the first campaign of Woodrow Wilson in 1912; and Wilson ranked with Jefferson and Lincoln among his three supreme heroes.

The world applauded and Americans were impressed; but an epigram can never defeat a legend; and Stevenson twice knew defeat on a humiliating scale.

What was the greatness of Stevenson? Even in death his complex spirit commands no unanimity. But on certain guiding principles, with the wisdom of the after years, all may agree.

Words were sacred to him because he refused to trifle with the truth. That is why he polished his speeches to the last reluctant minute, to the despair of his friends and the torment of reporters. He wished to say exactly what he meant. He was not seeking merely the sheen of eloquence, though eloquence often came in the crackle of a vivid epigram, the gaiety of a twinkling sarcasm, the sudden felicity of an inevitable phrase, or the exaltation of a moral appeal.

He had a higher aim in view than his place as America's prose laureate. He wanted words on the political platform to be used as counters of truth and never as weapons of deception. He has left us his example to shame those who fall below his standards.

Was Stevenson, the master of noble words, also the servant of noble causes?

His was the first prophetic voice in a national campaign that dared to denounce Negro wrongs as an outrage on American rights. There would never have been a Suez war if his advice had been followed in good time and if an international police force had been placed in the Gaza strip.

No one can take from Stevenson the distinction of being the first American statesman fully to recognize the definite end of the colonial era and the growing importance of the emergent nations.

He pleaded for a nuclear test ban treaty when others denounced this advocacy as theatrical folly. He strove for an end to the arms race though he knew the barbed stratagems of Communist power far better than most of his critics.

He argued with a certain spacious courtesy that made him for some 15 years the most admired and trusted spokesman of American policy on the world scene.

We have no way of knowing what leadership in the White House would have done to Stevenson. Lesser men have grown in stature and in power of decision. He, too, might have found resources of character within himself that would have provided the crowning proof of his greatness. It is more than an act of faith, under the shadow of death, to believe that this last felicity would have been granted to him.

Almost from the first it has been common talk among his friends that Stevenson's work as Ambassador to the United Nations was uncongenial to him. No one in that position

can ever share fully in the shaping of policy. He must often speak from a brief prepared in Washington instead of crying aloud the mandates of his conscience.

But he served two presidents in this campaign for peace, though with a chafed spirit, because he knew he brought personal gifts to America's cause that were unique and invulnerable. And two Presidents honored him deeply for it.

When his vagrant melancholy lifted, as it always did at the touch of wit or the challenge of a fresh idea, he could be a companion so beguiling that time folded its wings and crept away into a corner, until the cascade of talk at last came to an end.

He honored us all by refusing to stoop in order to conquer. Now we are left with huddle of grief-stricken memories when only yesterday we had a valiant friend and a radiant champion.

Tread lightly, for here is name certain to blossom in the dust.

To the Church
ON TALKING WITH THE VIETCONG

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Joseph Kraft is one of the most perceptive American commentators on Vietnam. In the August 5 issue of the New York Review of Books, Mr. Kraft reviews the recent book of Jean Lacouture, a leading French expert on Vietnam, who has studied that country for the last 2 decades. Mr. Kraft has written an excellent review of Mr. Lacouture's book which contains a comprehensive account of events in Vietnam for the last decade. Mr. Kraft concludes his review, entitled, "Understanding the Vietcong," by saying:

Official apologists for our present policy, while acknowledging its dangers, often insist that there is no alternative . . . there remains an alternative well known to all politically alert Vietnamese. . . . It is the alternative of negotiations between the Saigon government and the Vietcong. Such talks are an absolute precondition to any reconciling of local differences. However, difficult to arrange they may now appear, direct discussions with the Vietcong will sooner or later have to take place if there is to be a settlement in Vietnam. For a struggle that began locally—and this is the central point to emerge from Lacouture's book—can also best be settled locally.

As one who has advocated discussions between the warring factions in Vietnam, including the Vietcong, I ask unanimous consent to have this review printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNDERSTANDING THE VIETCONG

("Le Vietnam Entre Deux Paix," by Jean Lacouture. Editions du Seuil, 266 pp., 17 N.F.)

(By Joseph Kraft)

High strategic themes, bureaucratic interests, intellectual baggage and many other kinds of junk have been piled onto the war in Vietnam. It has been called to a fatal test of will between communism and freedom. It has been described as the critical battle in the struggle between China and the United States. It has also been described as the critical battle in the struggle between China and the Soviet Union. On its outcome there is supposed to rest the future of southeast Asia; and so it has also been sometimes described as the critical battle between China and India. At a minimum the Dr. Strangeloves of "sublimated war" claim that Vietnam poses the question whether a nuclear power can mobilize the kind of force required to contain guerrilla

August 4, 1965

18674

warfare. And with so much at stake it seems to make sense that the greatest power on earth should send as ambassador to a kind of Asian Ruritania its leading military man and, on two occasions, one of its best-known political figures.

To those who think it does make sense, which seems to include practically everybody in the United States, Jean Lacouture's new book on Vietnam will come as a kind of revelation. He announces his almost revolutionary theme in the opening sentence: "Vietnam," he writes, "exists." His book is about a particular place and a struggle for primacy there. It is, in other words, a political book. It deals with the elements and forces of the conflict, not as if they were apocalyptic and millennial events but as political phenomena. To read Lacouture after a dose of the official and even the journalistic literature which we get in this country is to pass from griffins and unicorns to Darwin and Mendel.

For writing a nonmythological political analysis of Vietnam, Lacouture has the ideal background. As a distinguished correspondent for various journals, including *Le Monde*, he has been to Vietnam repeatedly since he first went there on the staff of General Leclerc in 1945. He has visited both North and South Vietnam several times. He has written on his subject often and at length, notably in a biographical study of Ho Chi-minh and as coauthor of a book on the Geneva truce of 1954. He knows all the leading figures on all sides from way back. Nor is he a narrow specialist. After a particularly baffling encounter with a Buddhist monk, for example, he can write: "Our seminars also train specialists in verbal equivocation and suave silences, but never, in our climate, has the sacerdotal smile taken on such an evasive efficaciousness." Moreover, the politics of underdeveloped countries, so mysterious to most of us, and so parochial to those who know only a single country, are familiar stuff to him. With his wife Simone, Lacouture has written the best study to date of Colonel Nasser's Egypt; and one of the best on Morocco since independence. While obviously a *pièce d'occasion*, his present book on Vietnam is of the same high quality.

His starting point in the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Just how the United States became connected with Diem has become a matter of controversy. Ramparts magazine has recently published an account purporting to show that a knot of American Catholic politicians and professional anti-Communists, depending largely upon Cardinal Spellman, promoted our support of the Diem regime. Perhaps. But history has a way of demolishing theories that trace large consequences to little groups of men. Far more important is the point urged in a brilliant study of the Vietnamese war by the international lawyer, Victor Bator.¹ Bator's argument is that in 1954, for reasons of domestic politics, the Eisenhower-Dulles regime broke with the policy of moving in concert with Britain and France and tried to establish South Vietnam as a bastion of anti-Communist resistance. President Diem was merely the vehicle for that effort.

He had little chance to succeed. Not because, as some say, South Vietnam cannot exist as a separate political entity. In Vietnam too, it is different in the South. South Vietnam in fact is one of the most richly diversified areas in the world. Its topography includes mountainous areas peopled by primitive tribes, arid plateaus, and a great alluvial plain. It is a leading producer of rice—a crop requiring the kind of intense personal cultivation that breeds an independent peasantry. The diversity fostered by occupation is further promoted by religious custom: South Vietnam's 14 million people

include large numbers of Catholics, Buddhists and Confucians, and all of them practice a kind of ancestor worship that places special emphasis on local custom. While Vietnamese political parties in the Western sense have existed only as affiliates of those that had grown up around the old political capital of Hanoi in the North, there remained—and remain—a multitude of local Southern sects (Lacouture likens them to "armed leagues") that mixed banditry with religion. Thanks to a loose provincial reign, the French, as Lacouture points out, had governed this melange for decades with no more difficulties than those found in the sleepiest of domestic departments—"Herault and Lot et Garonne." Painfully, any Southern regime that was likely to succeed would have to be pluralistic, offering great scope for local differences—and this was especially true for the regime of President Diem, a Catholic aristocrat from the high plains and thus markedly different from the majority of Vietnamese.

But if there was one thing the Diem regime lacked, it was sympathy for pluralism. The ruling family was imbued with an extra touch of fervor, something of the absolute. The President had an attachment to the ancient society of Annam—high aristocracy, closed castes, intellectual heirarchies * * * he wanted to revive the old order, the morality of the fathers, the respect for the master. His brother and political counselor, Ngo Dinh Nhu, saw in the strategic hamlets, a re-creation of the fortified towns of the Middle Ages that he had studied as a budding medievalist at the Ecole des Chartres. Another brother, Ngo Dinh Can, who ruled the northern provinces, lived in the old family mansion, dressed in the ancient Vietnamese style, and slept on the floor. Madame Nhu's war on night life and dancing was thus not a personal aberration, but a true expression of the absolute traditionalism that typified the regime.

Confronting a diversity of political factions, however, single-minded dogmatism can prevail only in a climate of strife—real or contrived. In the beginning the Diem regime had to fight against the sects and the remnants of French influence. In the course of this struggle, President Diem evicted the former Emperor, Bao Dai, and became President "in a plebiscite as honest as could be expected." But having taken the sects and the crown, the Diem regime did not know how to use its victory to develop harmony. Having won a battle, it preferred war to peace * * *. In 1955, any opponent was denounced as a relic of the sects of feudal rebels supported by colonialism. Beginning in 1956, any opponent is called a Communist. It was in this context that the regime initiated in 1956 a campaign against the Vietcong—a name manufactured by the regime and supposed to mean Vietnamese Communists, but actually embracing a far wider spectrum of political opinion. In the same spirit the Saigon regime, against the advice of the American Ambassador, publicly abrogated the clause of the 1954 Geneva agreement calling for reunification of Vietnam through free elections—a clause that Hanoi could certainly not have accepted at the time. But in the process of fighting the Vietcong, the regime called forth the two forces that were to prove its undoing.

One of these was the army of the Republic of Vietnam, or Arvin as it came to be called. In connection with Arvin, it is worth noting one of the intellectual sleights-of-hand common to Americans who believe it is good for this country to support reactionary governments abroad. After all, they say in the Montesquieu manner, democracy cannot be exported; the conditions that promote free institutions in the United States do not exist elsewhere, and one should not impose American mores uncritically. The group that most uncritically projects American ways, that is most ready to overlook and override local custom, and to ignore the tradition of

centuries, is the American military. And nothing proves it better than Arvin.

It is an army created in the image of our own. It wears American parade dress and American fatigues. It rides around in jeeps and helicopters and jet planes. It is organized in corps, divisions, and companies and has special forces and ranger battalions. It has most of the weaponry available to American forces. It is full of keen young officers, trained at staff schools in the United States, bursting with energy and with clear answers to cloudy questions. What it does not have, of course, is the cultural base of the American army. It does not, to be specific, have a strong sense of discipline, nor does it have a tradition that discourages meddling in political affairs. On the contrary, Arvin was called into being by political affairs; and the younger the officers the more ardently political they tend to be. How could anyone imagine that a force so modern in its outlook, so uninhibited and unrestricted in its background, would for long yield pride of place to a regime as old-fashioned and backward-looking as the Diem government? As Lacouture points out, military plotting against the government got underway as soon as the army was organized. In 1960 and again in 1962 attempted military coups came very close to toppling the regime. Only by fantastic juggling, only by setting unit against unit and commander against commander and by planting spies and rumors everywhere was the regime able to maintain its hold over the army at all. It is typical that on the eve of the coup that succeeded, the regime itself was planning a fake coup to discover which of its generals were loyal. Sooner or later, in short, a military coup would have unseated Diem. As much as anything in history can be, his undoing by his own praetorian guard was inevitable—a consideration to bear in mind when there develops in Washington a hunt for scapegoats who will be charged with having lost Vietnam by causing the downfall of the Diem regime.

The second force brought into being by the absolutism of the regime was the Vietcong. In keeping with the Geneva Accords, almost all the guerrilla forces, and especially their leaders, who had fought for Ho Chi-minh against the French moved above the 17th parallel to North Vietnam. There remained, however, in scattered areas of the South, Communists loyal to the North Vietnamese government in Hanoi. Precisely because they were disciplined Communists, loyal to the party line, they did not initiate trouble against the Diem regime. For Hanoi had troubles of its own—first the resettlement; then construction of new industry; and at all times a chronic food shortage and great difficulties with the peasantry. Feeling itself far more vulnerable than the Saigon regime, the last thing Hanoi wanted to do was to give the Diem government an excuse for intervention. For that reason, Hanoi protested in only the most perfunctory way when the clause providing for reunification through free elections was unilaterally abrogated by Saigon. For the same reason, Hanoi tried repeatedly (and unsuccessfully) to make deals with the Saigon regime, offering to trade its manufactures for foodstuffs. And for exactly the same reason, Hanoi kept the Communists in the South under wraps. As one Communist quoted by Lacouture said later: "Between 1954 and 1958 we were pacifist opportunists. We hesitated to draw conclusions from the Diemist dictatorship and its excesses."

But, as Lacouture shows, other victims of the Diem regime were under no such discipline. Tribal leaders, local notables, independent peasants and small holders, not to mention intellectuals and professional men in Saigon, found themselves threatened by the militancy of the regime. Many were thrown into prison—for example, the present chief of state, Phan Khac Suu, and one of the

¹ "Vietnam: A Diplomatic Tragedy," Oceana Publications, New York.

August 4, 1965

18675

more recent Premiers, Phan Huy Quat. Others resisted, and inevitably they looked to the Communists for support. Thus local pressure for the Communists to start things began to build up. As one Vietcong leader told Lacouture: "There was pressure at the base. An old peasant said to me: 'If you don't join the fight we're through with you.' (I have heard very similar explanation in my own talks with Vietcong officials.) In short, like almost all rebellions, the Vietcong revolt was not set off by some master planner working from the outside. It was generated by local conditions.

The course of events outlined by Lacouture follows this pattern exactly. The formal establishment of the National Liberation Front, or political arm of the Vietcong, was initiated at a meeting held in the U Minh Forest of southeast South Vietnam in March 1960. According to Lacouture, the chief document before the meeting was a letter urging the establishment of the Liberation Front written from a Saigon prison by a non-Communist who is now head of the front, Nguyen Huu Tho. While at least two of those at the March meeting seem to have been Communists, most of those on the spot were not. The chief items in the declaration that was then put out were purely local grievances. And it was only after the front was already in motion, in September 1960, that Hanoi gave it explicit support. As Lacouture puts it: "The leaders in Hanoi did not take this turn [toward backing revolt in the south] except under the express demand and the moral pressure of the local militants."

Once Hanoi had formally supported the front, there was no backing down. With the United States supporting the Saigon regime, there came about the famous buildup of military operation. In failing to see the complexity of the domestic pressures that drove the United States to underwrite Saigon, Lacouture misses a vital, the only flaw in his book. But how little of the underlying political situation has really been changed by this buildup. The confrontation, to be sure, has become more dangerous. The American role as backer of the Saigon regime, and especially its army, is now more exposed. So is Hanoi's role as supplier of men and weapons to the Vietcong. Still, there remains some independence in Saigon—witness the Buddhists' maneuverings and the Government crises that regularly catch American officials by surprise. The National Liberation Front retains a central committee that seems to be less than a third Communist, and that is, as it always was, especially oriented toward the problems of South Vietnam. While it is true that more Communists are to be found on the intermediary levels of the NLF, neither Lacouture nor others who know the Vietcong leaders well believe that they are fighting in order to impose a North Vietnamese Communist dictatorship on the South. The chief problem remains what it always was—how to find a political means of reconciling the great diversity of interest and opinion in South Vietnam.

Official apologists for our present policy, while acknowledging its dangers, often insist that there is no alternative. This is a little like the peddler selling pills during the Lisbon earthquake who replied, when asked whether the pills would do any good: "No, but what do you have that's better?" The comparison would be even more apt if the peddler had had a hand in starting the earthquake. Certainly it is true that the alternatives have been obscured by the resolute refusal of most of the American press to study carefully the politics of the war, including the politics of the Vietcong. But, in fact, there remains an alternative well known to all politically alert Vietnamese (though it is difficult to voice because of increasingly harsh American policy). It is the alternative

of negotiations between the Saigon government and the Vietcong. Such talks are an absolute precondition to any reconciling of local differences. However difficult to arrange they may now appear, direct discussions with the Vietcong will sooner or later have to take place if there is to be a settlement in Vietnam. For a struggle that began locally—and this is the central point to emerge from Lacouture's book—can also best be settled locally.

L.B.J.'S JULY 28 SPEECH—EXCELLENT REBUTTAL OF SENATOR MORSE ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in his strong attack on the policies of the administration and on the statement by the Senator from Wisconsin, left the impression, in my judgment, that the President has not been working hard for peace. The President's activities on behalf of peace are well known throughout the country. I ask unanimous consent that the brilliant and remarkable statement delivered by the President last Wednesday, July 28, which constitutes an excellent rebuttal of this afternoon's remarks by the Senator from Oregon, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 29, 1965]

TEXT OF STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM CONFLICT

(The text of President Johnson's formal statement at his White House news conference yesterday)

My fellow Americans:

Not long ago I received a letter from a woman in the Midwest. She wrote: "My dear Mr. President, in my humble way I am writing to you about the crisis in Vietnam . . . I have . . . a son who is now in Vietnam. My husband served . . . in World War II . . . Our country was at war, but now this time it's something I don't understand. Why?"

I have tried to answer that question a dozen times and more. I have discussed it fully in Baltimore in April, in Washington in May, and in San Francisco in June. Let me now discuss it again. Why must young Americans—born into a land exultant with hope and golden with promise—toll and suffer and sometimes die in such a remote and distant place?

The answer, like war itself, is not easy. But it echoes clearly from the painful lessons of half a century. Three times in my lifetime—in two World Wars and in Korea—Americans have gone to far lands to fight. We have learned—at a terrible and brutal cost—that retreat does not bring safety, or weakness peace.

DIFFERENT KIND OF WAR

It is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam. This is a different kind of war. There are no marching armies or solemn declarations. Some citizens of South Vietnam at times with understandable grievances have joined in the attack on their own government. But we must not let this mask the central fact that this is really war.

It is guided by North Vietnam and it is spurred by Communist China. Its goal is to conquer the south, to defeat American power, and to extend the Asiatic domination of communism.

And there are great stakes in the balance. Most of the non-Communist nations of Asia cannot, by themselves, resist the grow-

ing might and grasping ambition of Asian communism. Our power is a vital shield. If we are driven from the fields in Vietnam, then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in our promise or protection. In each land the forces of independence would be weakened. An Asia so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself.

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there was no one else.

Nor would surrender in Vietnam bring peace, because we learned from Hitler at Munich that success only feeds the appetite of aggression. The battle would be renewed in one country and then another country, bringing with it perhaps even larger and crueler conflict, as we have learned from the lessons of history.

PROMISES ARE NOTED

Moreover, we are in Vietnam to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges of the American Nation. Three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and your present President—over 11 years, have committed themselves and have promised to help defend this small and valiant nation.

Strengthened by that promise, the people of South Vietnam have fought for many long years. Thousands of them have died. Thousands more have been crippled and scarred by war. We just cannot now dishonor our word or abandon our commitment or leave those who believed us and who trusted us to the terror and repression and murder that would follow. This, then, my fellow Americans, is why we are in Vietnam.

What are our goals in this war-stained land?

First, we intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated by force of arms.

They are not easily convinced. In recent months they have increased their fighting forces and their attacks.

I have asked the commanding general—General Westmoreland—what he needs to meet mounting aggression. He has told me. And we will meet his needs.

I have today ordered to Vietnam the Air Mobile Division, and certain other forces which will raise our fighting strength from 75,000 to 125,000 men almost immediately. Additional forces will be needed later, and they will be sent as requested. This will make it necessary to increase our active fighting forces by raising the monthly draft call from 17,000 over a period of time to 35,000 per month, and for us to step up our campaign for voluntary enlistments.

NO CALL TO RESERVES

After this past week of deliberations, I have concluded that it is not essential to order Reserve units into service now. If that necessity should later be indicated, I will give the matter most careful consideration and I will give the country an adequate notice before taking such action, but only after full preparations.

We have also discussed with the Government of South Vietnam lately the steps that we will take to substantially increase their own effort, both on the battlefield and toward reform and progress in the villages. Ambassador Lodge is now formulating a new program to be tested upon his return to that area.

I have directed Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara to be available immediately to the Congress to review with these committees, the appropriate congressional committees, what we plan to do in these areas. I have asked them to be able to answer the questions of any Members of Congress.

Secretary McNamara, in addition, will ask the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a limited amount to present legislation to help meet part of this new cost until a sup-

August 4, 1965

18676

plemental measure is ready, and hearings can be held when the Congress assembles in January.

In the meantime, we will use the authority contained in the present defense appropriation bill under consideration to transfer funds in addition to the additional money that we will ask.

These steps, like our other actions in the past, are carefully measured to do what must be done to bring an end to aggression and a peaceful settlement.

READY FOR CONFERENCES

We do not want an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can perceive, nor will we bluster or bully or flaunt our power, but we will not surrender and we will not retreat, for behind our American pledge lies the determination and resources, I believe, of all the American Nation.

Second, once the Communists know, as we know, that a violent solution is impossible, then a peaceful solution is inevitable.

We are ready now, as we have always been, to move from the battlefield to the conference table. I have stated publicly, and many times, again and again, America's willingness to begin unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time. Fifteen efforts have been made to start these discussions with the help of 40 nations throughout the world, but there has been no answer.

But we are going to persist, if persist we must, until death and desolation have led to the same conference table where others could now join us at a much smaller cost.

I have spoken many times of our objectives in Vietnam. So has the government of South Vietnam. Hanoi has set forth its own proposal. We are ready to discuss their proposals and our proposals and any proposals of any government whose people may be affected, for we fear the meeting room no more than we fear the battlefield.

WELCOMES ASSISTANCE

In this pursuit, we welcome and we ask for the concern and the assistance of any nation and all nations. If the United Nations and its officials or any one of its 114 members can by deed or word, private initiative or public action, bring us nearer an honorable peace, then they will have the support and gratitude of the United States of America.

I have directed Ambassador Goldberg to go to New York today to present immediately to Secretary General U Thant a letter from me requesting that all of the resources, energy, and immense prestige of the United Nations be employed to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace in Vietnam.

I made a similar request at San Francisco a few weeks ago, because we do not seek the destruction of any government, nor do we covet a foot of any territory, but we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Vietnam shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the south, or throughout all Vietnam under international supervision and that they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.

This was the purpose of the 1954 agreements which the Communists have now cruelly shattered. If the machinery of those agreements was tragically weak, its purposes still guide our actions. As battle rages, we will continue as best we can to help the good people of South Vietnam enrich the condition of their lives, to feed the hungry and to tend the sick, and teach the young, and shelter the homeless, and help the farmer to increase crops, and the worker to find a job.

It is an ancient but still terrible irony that while many leaders of men create division in pursuit of grand ambitions, the children of man are really united in the simple elusive desire for a life of fruitful and rewarding toil.

WOULD HELP ALL ASIA

As I said at Johns Hopkins in Baltimore, I hope that one day we can help all the people in Asia toward that desire. Eugene Black has made great progress since my appearance in Baltimore in that direction—not as the price of peace, for we are ready always to bear more painful cost, but rather as a part of our obligations of justice toward our fellow man.

Let me also add now a personal note. I do not find it easy to send the flower of our youth, our finest young men, into battle. I have spoken to you today of the divisions and the forces and the battalions and the units. But I know all of them, every one. I have seen them in a thousand streets, of a hundred towns, of every State in this Union—working and laughing and building, and filled with hope and life. I think I know too how their mothers weep and their families sorrow. This is the most agonizing and most painful duty of your President.

There is something else, too. When I was young, poverty was so common we didn't know it had a name. An education was something you had to fight for. Water was really life itself. I have now been in public life 35 years, more than three decades, and in each of those 35 years I have seen good men, and wise leaders, struggle to bring the blessings to the land of our people. Now, I am the President.

It is now my opportunity to help every child get an education, to help every Negro and every American citizen have an equal opportunity, to have every family get a decent home and to help bring healing to the sick and dignity to the old.

As I have said before, that is what I have lived for. That is what I have wanted all my life since I was a little boy, and I do not want to see all those hopes and all those dreams of so many people for so many years now drowned in the wasteful ravishes of cruel wars.

I am going to do all I can to see that never happens. But I also know, as a realistic public servant, that as long as there are men who hate and destroy, we must have the courage to resist or we will see it all, all that we have built, all that we hope to build, all our dreams of freedom—all—will be swept away in the flood of conquest.

So, too, this shall not happen. We will stand in Vietnam.

LITTLEFIELD, TEX., RESIDENTS REVITALIZE THEIR CITY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a fine example of cooperative effort by responsible citizenship is now being exhibited in the town of Littlefield, Tex. Without assistance from the Federal Government or the State, the residents of this small Texas town have joined together to undertake a massive beautification project for their downtown area.

I ask unanimous consent that an accounting of this beautification project from the Lubbock Avalanche Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD to illustrate the cooperation and concern of Littlefield residents for the progress of their city in undertaking this progressive project.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAUTIFICATION—DOWNTOWN PROJECT SET AT
LITTLEFIELD

(By Tanner Laine)

LITTLEFIELD.—While a lot of towns and cities were planning and talking about re-

vitalizing their downtown business districts, Littlefield was doing something about it.

At a public meeting scheduled at 7 p.m. today in the county courtroom here, details of the do-it-yourself project will be launched.

Littlefield, a progressive town of 8,000, will undertake the first district beautification project of its type in the State.

This is no chamber of commerce pipe dream or municipal project. This is for real because it was instigated, and will be carried out, by property owners themselves.

EIGHTEEN BLOCKS INCLUDED

Here in a nutshell package is what will be done: The Littlefield business district will be improved to the tune of a \$371,000 beautification project encompassing 18 blocks. The heart of the town's business district will take on the appearance of a neat and beautiful mall, complete to planter boxes, canopied rest stations and sidewalks of colored stone.

The plan calls for free parking and one way traffic flows.

How far away is all this from reality? Residents will be told tonight that work begins April 7.

The plan is sure fire. There will be no additional taxes to put it over. Merchants and businessmen will foot the bill on a front foot assessment basis.

One result is certain—Littlefield will emerge as one of the best groomed towns in the Southwest.

Official name of the project is: "Downtown Park 'N' Shop." The name is a giveaway to the whole objective—an attractive downtown business area with parking facilities.

Parking will be free. Littlefield sacked its meters a couple of months ago. Also, several offstreet parking lots have been leased, paved, and will be ready when the project gets underway.

Both angle and parallel parking on the streets are provided in the project plan.

Beautification of the Littlefield downtown area will be centered primarily on Phelps Avenue, XIT and LFD (named for ranches) Drives (from 6th Street north to U.S. Highway 84; and the accompanying side streets—2d, 3d, 4th and 5th Streets.

NO FEDERAL, STATE FUNDS

Backers of the project, the business folks of Littlefield, want it emphasized that not 1 cent of Federal or State money is involved. Littlefield residents are paying out of their own pockets.

Resistance is nominal. From the start, there was a 93 percent approval by business firms in the area to be revitalized. Since the start of the idea, the percentage of approval has risen.

What exactly will be done? First, the streets involved will be widened. Gleaming new 10-foot wide sidewalks in front of stores will be relaid in white concrete. Then 4-foot wide sidewalks of color ranging from coral to sapphire blue will be laid next to the streets. Composition of these sidewalks will be of crushed aggregate in multiple and harmonizing colors.

REST AREAS PLANNED

The planter boxes and canopied rest areas will be strategically located along the sidewalks and in places, projecting into the street.

Sidewalks will be expanded at the end of each block into platforms which have either 20 by 20 canopied benches or gardens.

A sample block would include 13 individual planter boxes in colored masonry, ranging in shape from rectangular to toadstool.

Each block will feature covered patio-type pedestrian crosswalks extending 22 feet into the street from both sides. A driving gap of 27 feet remains.

XIT and LFD Streets, which run parallel to Phelps Avenue, will be widened 6 feet. New sidewalks will be laid.

strictures about weapons in the hands of its citizens, must assume more responsibility for crime.

The British board requires victims to have reported their injuries promptly to the police or to have established their validity in court proceedings.

Property damage is not compensated because the system is geared to the impact of major disaster on earning power and the expense of medical care.

New Zealand has a similar compensation program which covers a list of specified violent crimes. Official cost figures and evaluations are not available, but early reports showed fewer claims and less expense than had been anticipated.

The Yarborough bill would provide a Compensation Commission for a crime of violence covered by Federal law, such as robbery of a federally insured bank. The Federal Commission would be limited to the District of Columbia and other Federal territory, but it could be a model for State governments.

Under the Yarborough bill, three well-paid, experienced lawyers would serve staggered 8-year terms on the Washington-based Commission. They would have broad powers and would not be restricted to courtroom rules of evidence.

The bill raises many problems, including that of keeping the compensation proceeding separate from the criminal trial, so that one would not prejudice the other.

This problem is not considered insoluble, but the bill's backers foresee months—maybe years—of study and discussion before Congress considers it actively.

Another problem—a political one—is that the debate might get bogged down in disputes over "socialized insurance" contentions or complaints against courts for being "soft on criminals," or against police for alleged laxity.

VIETNAM: STUCK TO THE TAR BABY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Arthur Krock, one of the Nation's most distinguished political columnists, published a telling column entitled "Trying To Get Loose From the Tar Baby," in the July 25 issue of the New York Times. Mr. Krock retells the fable, relating it to Vietnam, and comments:

Thus once more a fable serves as an excellent means to make a complex situation clear—in this instance one which could not even have been imagined at the time of the telling as a situation in which the United States would ever find itself. Certainly it is stuck hard in a tar baby. Certainly its own errors of foresight have stuck it deeper than was intended. Certainly one of the responsible factors is the concept of the mission of the United States as morally and militarily obligated to oppose the spread of communism anywhere in the world, single-handed if necessary, and whether or not beyond our reasonable sphere of national security and interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IN THE NATION: TRYING TO GET LOOSE FROM
THE TAR BABY
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The means employed by President Johnson and his principal advisers on the conduct of the war in Vietnam to call public attention to the urgency of their deliberations are justified by the gravity of the problem and the need to prepare the American people for whatever new sacrifices may be required of them. This atmosphere has been intensified for the

purpose by daily official emphasis on the secrecy by which the President has bound the participants to reveal no detail of the conferences.

This elaborate public relations technique would lose its justification only if it should develop that the decisions of the conferences are not for the deeper involvement of the United States in the war, with the much graver portent the expansion would create. But the general impression among qualified observers is that that is the most unlikely outcome of the White House meetings.

DESPERATE PROBLEM

The decisions which have been in the making, or have been made, may be public property by the time this dispatch appears in print. But while they may encourage, and eventually fulfill, hope of at least moderating the desperate nature of the problem of Vietnam, their immediate product will be a more realistic coming-to-grips with its true magnitude than the administration has publicly conceded before.

The ways and the plights of men and of nations have been recorded, examined, analyzed and adjudged in countless works of history and fiction. And, as in the instance of Vietnam, contemporary writings and oratory have dealt with them in millions of words. But often the serious character of these plights has been made more comprehensible to humanity by humorous fable than by solemn exposition. Such a fable, uncanny in the comparison it invites with the involvement of the United States in Vietnam, is "The Wonderful Tar Baby Story."

AFT NURSERY TALE

Like the other nursery tales Uncle Remus told to "the little boy" in Georgia long ago, this one concerned the unending effort of Brer Fox to catch and eat Brer Rabbit. An unusual series of errors of foresight by the rabbit had for the first time put him in a predicament from which no exit was in sight except down the fox's gullet. This menacing situation arose after Brer Fox, smarting under Brer Rabbit's recent success in making him look foolish in the matter of the "calamus root" hoax, fixed up a contraption of tar and turpentine that the fox named the tar baby, set up in the big road, and lay in the bushes to await developments.

He didn't have long to wait, as the tale was told, because very shortly Brer Rabbit came pacing down the road, lippity-clippity, clippity-lippity, as sassy as a jay bird. Brer Fox lay low. When the rabbit spied the tar baby he reared up on his hind legs in astonishment, and then, remembering his social obligations, wished it the time of day, praised the weather and inquired how the tar baby's symptoms seemed to segashuate that morning. No reply was forthcoming, and Brer Fox winked his eye and laid low.

At this point the offended Brer Rabbit lost his temper and proceeded on actions without looking ahead to their potential consequences. Continuing to get no response from the tar baby—to an inquiry whether deafness was the cause of its refusal to talk, or to information that Brer Rabbit could holler louder if this was necessary, or to the stated conclusion that the tar baby was stuck up and the obvious cure was to bust him wide open—Brer Rabbit fit the action to the word.

HITTING THE TAR BABY

First he blipped the tar baby on the side of the head, and his hand got stuck. The tar baby went on saying nothing and Brer Fox went on laying low. Second, the rabbit fetched a blip with his other hand, and that got stuck. The rabbit lost the use of his feet in the same way, and then the use of his head when he butted the tar baby crank-sided, after getting no response to a demand to be turned loose.

At this planned-in-advance strategic moment Brer Fox arose from the bushes, looking as innocent as a mockingbird; observed

that the rabbit appeared to be sort of stuck up that morning; rolled on the ground and laughed and laughed until he could laugh no more; and gasped out that this time Brer Rabbit would dine with him, to partake of some calamus root the fox had thoughtfully laid in, and no excuse would be accepted.

"Did the fox eat the rabbit?" the little boy asked Uncle Remus. He might have and he might not, was the reply: at any rate that was the end of the story for the present, though "some say" that "Jedge" Bear came to the aid of the rabbit, and some say he didn't. Which pretty closely matches the conflict in speculations of the outcome of Averell Harriman's mission to Moscow.

A FABLE CLARIFIES

Thus once more a fable serves as an excellent means to make a complex situation clear—in this instance one which could not even have been imagined at the time of the telling as a situation in which the United States would ever find itself. Certainly it is stuck hard in a tar baby. Certainly its own errors of foresight have stuck it deeper than was intended. Certainly one of the responsible factors is the concept of the mission of the United States as morally and militarily obligated to oppose the spread of communism anywhere in the world, single-handed if necessary, and whether or not beyond our reasonable sphere of national security and interest.

But fables are not necessarily conclusive as analogies to the courses of men and nations, only of the durable origins of the human tendency to err. If Brer Rabbit had been a real member of his species instead of the quasi-human Uncle Remus suggested by giving him speech, he would never have assumed the arrogant role of lord of the highway in "The Wonderful Tar Baby Story."

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN WYOMING

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, my State, Wyoming, is known far and wide as the Equality State. It is a name we like, deriving as it does from the fact that Wyoming was the first jurisdiction in the Nation to grant women equal suffrage. We took that step while still a territory in 1869. When Wyoming entered the Union 75 years ago it became, also, the first State to accord women an equal right to vote and to hold public office.

Mr. President, Dr. T. A. Larson, a distinguished western historian, who is head of the department of history and director of the School of American Studies at the University of Wyoming, as well as a valued colleague of mine, has traced in definitive terms the history of this landmark legislation. It appeared recently in the Pacific Northwest Quarterly and is slated for somewhat fuller treatment in Dr. Larson's "History of Wyoming," scheduled for publication in the fall. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Larson's article "Woman Suffrage in Wyoming," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN WYOMING

(By T. A. Larson)

(NOTE.—T. A. Larson is head of the department of history and director of the School of American Studies at the University of Wyoming. The present article is a condensation of parts of two chapters in his "History of Wyoming," to be published by the University of Nebraska Press in the fall of 1965.)

In the preface to "Laws of Wyoming, 1869," Territorial Secretary Edward M. Lee singled out one law for special attention: "Among

other acts, a law was passed enfranchizing women; thus, by a single step, placing the youngest territory on earth in the vanguard of civilization and progress." Lee was, of course, right in focusing attention on this act, for Wyoming was the first U.S. territory, and later would be the first State (1890), to give women full rights to vote and hold office.¹ No other action of the 1869 legislature, or of any other Wyoming Legislature, has received so much attention.

The question is often asked, Why did woman suffrage come first in Wyoming? As might be expected, causation was complex, and the answer, if it is to be worth much, cannot be given in a few words. It was certainly not a bolt from the blue. Limited suffrage rights, for example in school elections, had been given to women from time to time in various parts of the country ever since 1776 when a few women had voted in New Jersey. Since the 1840's suffragettes had been campaigning vigorously in the East. A woman suffrage weekly, the Revolution, began publication in New York City in 1868. The Cheyenne Leader said in October 1868: "There are few of our weekly exchanges that we peruse with more interest than we do the Revolution. * * * The Revolution is bound to win."

Woman suffrage amendments were proposed in both houses of Congress in 1868, and the American Woman Suffrage Association was organized in 1869. Woman suffrage bills had been introduced in several State and territorial legislatures. One house of the Nebraska Legislature had passed such a bill in 1856, and the Dakota Territorial Legislature had failed by just one vote to pass a woman suffrage bill in January 1869. Clearly the conditions were ripe for a legislative victory somewhere. The Wyoming legislators had the option of jumping in at the head of the parade or of watching it pass by. Had they failed to act as they did in December 1869, the honors would have gone to Utah Territory, whose legislators were right at their heels; Utah adopted woman suffrage in February 1870.

Apart from the national pressures which promised a breakthrough somewhere very soon, certain conditions made it probable that victory would come first in a western territory. One factor was the scarcity of women. With only one woman in Wyoming over 21 for every six men over 21 (1870 census), adoption of women suffrage was less revolutionary than it would have been where there were as many women as men.

Western territories were desperately eager for publicity which would attract population. Free advertising was a common explanation in the 1870's and 1880's for Wyoming's action. The Cheyenne Leader, for example, said, when the act was adopted: "We now expect at once

quite an immigration of ladies to Wyoming"; and it added in March 1870 that this legislation was "nothing more or less than a shrewd advertising dodge. A cunning device to obtain for Wyoming a widespread notoriety."

In the 1890's, the historian, C. G. Coutant, interviewed surviving members of the 1869 legislature. He reported that "One man told me that he thought it right and just to give women the right to vote.² Another man said he thought it would be a good advertisement for the territory. Still another said that he voted to please someone else, and so on."³

It was often said in the early days that the whole thing was done as a joke. Strongest support for this interpretation lies in an editorial in the Cheyenne, Wyo., Tribune, October 8, 1870, apparently written by Edward M. Lee, who had been secretary of the territory in 1869:

"Once, during the session, amid the greatest hilarity, and after the presentation of various funny amendments and in the full expectation of a gubernatorial veto, an act was passed enfranchising the women of Wyoming. The bill, however, was approved, became a law, and the youngest territory placed in the van of progress. * * * How strange that a movement destined to purify the muddy pool of politics * * * should have originated in a joke. * * * All honor to them, say we, to Wyoming's first legislature."

Since Secretary Lee, himself a champion of woman suffrage, worked closely with the legislators, his testimony is important, although he did not say that everyone involved was joking, and William H. Bright, who introduced the bill, later denied that he had done so as a joke.

Gov. John A. Campbell, of Wyoming, was reported to have said in Boston in 1871 that "no public discussion preceded passage." While the bill may not have been discussed much, the subject of woman suffrage was often discussed in the Cheyenne newspapers during the months preceding the legislature's action. Much of the newspaper comment concerned the activities of Anna Dickinson, a nationally known suffragette. After reading about her in an Omaha paper, the editor of the Cheyenne Leader, Nathan A. Baker, proposed in June 1869: "Let's try to get her here." Ten days later, June 17, Miss Dickinson passed through Cheyenne on her way to fulfill speaking engagements in California. The Leader reported that when the "celebrated lady" stepped out on the platform for a breath of air, she was "surrounded by a crowd of staring mortals. She sought refuge in a passenger coach. She was then subjected to an enflaming fire from the eyes of those who succeeded in flattening their noses against the car windows. * * * Anna is good looking. * * *"

After it was announced that Miss Dickinson would lecture in Cheyenne on her way east the Leader hailed her approaching visit as "quite an event in our city" and as "an opportunity to listen to one of the most entertaining and graceful of female orators." On September 24, 1869, Secretary Lee introduced Miss Dickinson to "some 250 people whom curiosity had attracted," according to the report in the Leader the next day. Governor Campbell was in the audience, but out-of-town legislators probably were not

present, since the legislature did not meet until mid-October. The editor of the Leader had little to say about Miss Dickinson's message, but he noted that "in person she is rather below medium height, and well formed; her face is rather of the oval type."

Another woman suffrage lecturer, Miss Redelia Bates of St. Louis, spoke in Cheyenne on November 5, 1869, just a week before William H. Bright announced that he intended to introduce a woman suffrage bill. The house of representatives had voted to let her use its hall, which she did. The Leader had made only a few comments about woman suffrage since Miss Dickinson's visit in September, but in anticipation of Miss Bates' arrival, it reported that she was beautiful and talented and that she had enjoyed a successful tour through Colorado. Just how many paid the advertised price of 50 cents to hear Miss Bates is in doubt; the Tribune reported "a large and appreciative audience," the Leader an audience "though not large * * * select and appreciative."

The Leader praised the lecturer's charm, asserting that "her presence would make any home a heaven," but it did not yet accept her argument. The Tribune, on the other hand, found her both charming and persuasive: "Miss Bates is exceedingly prepossessing in personal appearance. Her arguments were unanswerable, except upon the basis of prejudice." Probably the Tribune review was written by Edward M. Lee, for he was financial backer of the paper and often wrote for it.

After Miss Bates' visit to Cheyenne, the Leader refrained from ridiculing woman suffrage during the legislative session. When William H. Bright introduced his bill, the Leader, under the heading, "Interesting Question," assumed a position of neutrality: "It will be up for consideration tonight, at the evening session, on which occasion many of our citizens will doubtless find it convenient to attend." When the bill passed both houses, the Leader's comment was noncommittal: "Ladies, prepare your ballots."

While awaiting Governor Campbell's decision, the Leader indicated qualified approval: "Although we have not yet been fully convinced of the wisdom or necessity of the measure, yet we have something of a curiosity to witness its practical operation and results, and we hope, as we believe, that Governor Campbell will approve the bill." Nathan Baker, editor of the Leader, was never an ardent supporter, but he had come a long way since Anna Dickinson first visited Cheyenne in June. And when the Governor signed the bill, Baker showed that, while he had been overcome temporarily by the charm of Redelia Bates, he was still loyal to Miss Dickinson: "Won't the irrepressible 'Annie D' come out here and make her home? We'll even give her more than the right to vote—she can run for Congress."

Unlike the Leader, the Tribune needed no conversion. It greeted passage of the bill with the accurate judgment that it "is likely to be the measure of the session, and we are glad our legislature has taken the initiative in this movement, which is destined to become universal. Better appear to lead than hinder when a movement is inevitable." The Tribune a week later hailed the Governor's signature with the headlines, "Wyoming Suffrage: Wyoming in the Van, All Honor to the Youngest Territorial Sister."

Although it is manifest that Baker, who was young (27) like most Wyoming men of the period, was attracted by Miss Dickinson (26) and Miss Bates (age unknown but young), he was repelled by Susan B. Anthony (49), whom he described in February 1870 as "the old maid whom celibacy has dried, and blasted, and mildewed, until nothing is left but a half crazy virago." One must conclude that it was fortunate that Miss Dickinson and Miss Bates, rather than Miss Anthony,

¹ The legislature was small, 9 in the upper house, which was known as the council, and 13 in the house of representatives. All legislators were Democrats. On final passage they voted 6-2 and 7-4. The Republican Governor, John A. Campbell, after 4 days of indecision, signed the act, which reads as follows: "Female Suffrage, chapter 31, An Act to Grant to the Women of Wyoming Territory the Right of Suffrage and To Hold Office.

"Be it enacted by the Council and House of Representatives of the Territory of Wyoming:

"SECTION 1. That every woman of the age of 21 years, residing in this territory, may at every election to be holden under the laws thereof, cast her vote. And her rights to the elective franchise and to hold office shall be the same under the election laws of the territory, as those of electors.

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

"Approved, Dec. 10, 1869."

² This is the reason stated on various occasions by William H. Bright, who introduced the bill.

³ Letter from C. G. Coutant to Frank W. Mondell, no date, on file in State archives and historical department, Cheyenne, Wyo.

"In several other articles in subsequent weeks, the Leader referred to Anna as "the female humbug," as one who lectured for the love of money and notoriety, and as "the pepper" of the women's rights movement as contrasted with "the vinegar," Susan B. Anthony.

August 4, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18685

tive FRANK EVANS of Pueblo, Colo., are familiar with our case. If you wish to verify our statements, you could talk to them.

We are also enclosing an editorial from our local newspaper which explains our situation—we have been afraid to send this article to anyone before, for fear of what the Internal Revenue Service would do to this man. As far as we know, all the farmers in the arid West have been deducting their entire water assessment as a business expense and this procedure was never questioned.

In our case the Internal Revenue agent had audited other returns on our own ditch and on similar ditches and allowed these people to deduct their full water assessment, but when he came to ours, he disallowed the water assessment as expense. When asked why, we were told "he just smartened up when he came to ours." After we refused to pay, this man began telephoning us long distance from his office at Lamar at various intervals and advised us that we should pay the amount owed, that it was small, only \$135; and several times he stated that we as taxpayers had no rights. Our statement of this man's calls could be verified by the records of the telephone company. We failed to see why all these telephone calls were necessary. He would let enough time lapse between calls until we would more or less put the matter out of our minds and then would call again and repeat his warning about our paying. We had paid the other part of the taxes we owed but refused to pay, the part concerning the water assessment.

It is our opinion that these calls only served to remind us how unfair we think our treatment by the Internal Revenue Service appears to be. We are small farmers, whose income is not large and during the years for which our returns were audited (1960, 1961, and 1962), we prepared our own income tax returns. Our ditch, the Highland Irrigation Co., is a very small ditch.

The latest development in our case is a request from the Internal Revenue Service that we make a 400-mile roundtrip to Denver for another conference with them, although the trial date for our case is set up in Tax Court for about November 15. It is very inconvenient for a farmer to make a trip during the busy summer season, what with irrigating, haying, and other farmwork, for a conference at which no pretrial settlement would ever be reached. Yet this is what Internal Revenue Service requests of a taxpayer.

It is also particularly galling to know that only ourselves and one other farmer around here are the only people to whom the Internal Revenue Service has disallowed the water assessment as expense, contrary to its allegations otherwise. This fact, along with the agent's treatment of us, makes us hope and pray that your investigating committee can bring to light the treatment that Internal Revenue Service seemingly gives to small people.

Should you be interested in any other facts on this case, we would be more than glad to send them to you and sincerely hope that your committee can aid in improving Internal Revenue Service policies.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. and MAE V. HUNTER.

[From the Pueblo (Colo.) Chieftain, July 22, 1965]

U.S. TAX AGENTS DENY INTIMIDATION CHARGES

WASHINGTON.—Internal Revenue Service officials from Boston denied at a Senate hearing Wednesday that they intimidate or harass individuals. "Such charges," they said, "are by people who are overemotional or trying to kill a case."

The officials testified before a judiciary subcommittee which has heard that IRS agents used electronic eavesdropping devices

and questionable investigative methods. There was testimony, too, about a Treasury Department "snooper school."

COMPLETES 3-DAY INQUIRY

The subcommittee completed a 3-day inquiry into the Boston Internal Revenue Service office, after one involving Pittsburgh, Pa., and Chairman EDWARD V. LONG, Democrat, of Missouri, said "any wiretapping or other use of listening devices was the fault of the Washington Internal Revenue Service headquarters and not the agents."

The "snooper school" and the furnishing of devices gave implied consent for their use," LONG said, adding "he expects IRS headquarters to take note of this."

Alvin M. Kelley, IRS director in Boston, said he could understand why some witnesses told the subcommittee they were harassed or intimidated. "But by and large," he said, "taxpayers cooperate with us and we with them."

HARASSMENT NOT TOLERATED

"I can understand, of course," he said, "why individuals who have been subjected to fraud investigations should subjectively feel that they have been harassed—but I assure you that our policy and general practice does not tolerate harassment."

Kelley and George L. Wilson, group supervisor of IRS intelligence in Boston, said wiretaps are used only in isolated cases in cooperation with other Federal agencies, and principally in security cases.

[From the Bent County (Colo.) Democrat, Mar. 4, 1965]

ROBERT HUNTER HAS BEEN VICTIM OF HARASSMENT BY INTERNAL REVENUE (By Earl E. Asbury)

The Internal Revenue Service's case against Robert Hunter has dragged on for over a year and it is our opinion Mr. Hunter has been the victim of persecution, harassment, and injustice.

This is all the more unusual because we are used to seeing IRS operate in a coldly businesslike way, making its moves with sureness, accuracy, and justice.

The Hunter case started over a year ago when IRS Agent Virgil Richmond, in checking over Mr. Hunter's tax returns for the 3 previous years, disallowed the expense deduction Mr. Hunter had taken for that part of his Highland Ditch assessment that went toward paying for the Highland Dam that was installed after the old one washed out in the flood of 1955 on the Picketwire River 12 miles south of Las Animas.

We do not particularly criticize Mr. Richmond for questioning the expense initially. We do criticize IRS for not clearing up the issue cleanly and logically after it came up, and applying the same decision to all.

As it is, Mr. Hunter has been assessed \$130 in back taxes (which he still refuses to pay). He has had a conference with the chief of the Denver IRS office in La Junta, another conference with the IRS appellate division in Denver, and now has a hearing scheduled for this fall before a tax judge in Denver.

Most people like to stay as far away from the income tax agents as they do from their undertaker. To have to spend some 2 years in the shadow of IRS as Mr. Hunter has had to do is unnecessary harassment. Especially since he took the same kind of expense deduction on his income tax form that other irrigation farmers in Bent County have taken since the beginning of time, and are still taking.

In brief, Mr. Hunter considered his whole irrigation assessment as a farming expense.

But IRS contends the Highland Dam which was built 9 years ago was a capital improvement, owned jointly by all the farmers who own shares in the Highland Canal Co.

Ordinarily, if you have a capital improvement, you can depreciate it. And if it is

destroyed by accident or an act of nature, you can benefit on your income tax return by claiming a capital loss.

But IRS seems to feel the dam is so solid it isn't depreciating each year. And IRS points out the limit of years has passed so that farmers under the Highland Ditch can't go back now and claim a capital loss on the old dam when the flood washed it out.

(Most local farmers feel building the dam wasn't a capital improvement anyway, but was merely replacing the old dam as you would a roof on your barn.)

The issue has dragged on too long without being resolved. If Mr. Hunter's expense deduction is going to be allowed, IRS should allow it and get off his back. If not, every other farmer under an irrigation ditch in the west should get the same treatment as Mr. Hunter and should have the portion of his ditch assessment that goes toward payment of his irrigation dam be disallowed as an expense. Only one other farmer in Bent County besides Mr. Hunter reported a similar disallowment.

It looks to me as if IRS is just looking for trouble. Because it will end up with approximately the same amount of taxes either route it takes.

If paying for the dam can continue to be considered an expense, farmers can take the whole ditch assessment as an expense deduction as they have been doing.

If IRS insists on counting the dam as a capital improvement, farmers should be permitted to take deductions for depreciation and capital losses when the dams wash out, so that their tax will balance out about the same either way in the long run.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT has introduced a bill in Congress to permit farmers to count the payments toward the dams as expenses if they choose to. It would probably help break the impasse if this bill would be approved.

THE REBEKAH HARKNESS FOUNDATION AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE DANCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a society cannot ignore the arts, nor its artists. One that does is inevitably poorer and in danger of losing much more, indeed. Hence it is, Mr. President, that we should give honor to those who enrich our art forms. It is with this in mind that I refer to an article from the July 28 issue of the New York Herald Tribune regarding Mrs. Rebekah Harkness' contributions in time and in money to the dance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report from the Herald Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARKNESS CREDO: TALENT MUST BE SERVED

(By Walter Terry)

"The people who stay in the middle don't interest me," said Rebekah Harkness, composer, sculptor and patroness of the arts. "It is the artist or the delinquent I care about—the point is to do something for the two extremes: on the one hand, to give the artist opportunities to release his talent; and on the other hand, to help the delinquent find himself through the disciplines of art."

To this end, Mrs. Harkness, through her own Rebekah Harkness Foundation and the foundation established by her late husband, William Hale Harkness, has provided desperately needed funds (totaling millions of dollars) to the arts, and to dance in particular. Harkness sponsorship aided Jerome Robbins' Ballets U.S.A. in a European tour,

August 4, 1965

promoted the Robert Joffrey Ballet from a small national company to one of international stature, and made possible free dance events, in collaboration with the New York Shakespeare Festival, in Central Park's Delacorte Theater.

A year ago, the Harkness dance enterprises embarked on new and expanded programs. The Harkness Ballet, which now numbers approximately 30 dancers, was founded with George Skibine and Donald Saddler as its artistic and assistant artistic director, respectively. The initial tour, which began in 1965, was booked in Europe and provided the new company with a sort of glorified New Haven in which to try out its new works and to discover its incipient strengths and passing weaknesses.

At the same time, Mrs. Harkness purchased the old Thomas Watson townhouse and launched the long and expensive process of having it converted into the Harkness House for the Ballet Arts in New York City. When it opens in the fall, as the home of the Harkness Ballet and as a center for ballet seminars, workshops, lecture-demonstrations, art exhibits related to dance, its many studios will foster not only ballet but music, design and literature as they relate to ballet.

"It has," says Mrs. Harkness of the new ballet house, "the airs and graces of a palazzo. Maybe I'll be criticized for its elegance but I do think that beautiful surroundings are important to the working artist. And I'm serious when I use the word 'working.' I mentioned earlier, didn't I, that I'm not concerned with those individuals who stay in the middle? Well, this means I'm interested in the worker-artist. For example, there is the professional—the real pro—who does a fine job on the equivalent of the good old 9 to 5 basis. I care about the one that works to 5:45, that works extra. The former is a 90 percent. He rarely does anything memorable. It's the extra 10 percent which counts. I guess it's the difference between the adequate and the inspirational.

"No, I'm not enough of a nut to believe that time heals all wounds nor that time creates talent. I'm not even certain just what makes for talent in the individual—chemical factors? Inspiration? Love?—but if talent is there, it needs time to grow. Nobody can put talent into another being. My job, and my privilege, is comparatively simple and that is to give release to talent that is already there. Maybe it's a minor talent—although we pray it is major—but it too deserves a chance. To put it bluntly, at our summer workshop at Watch Hill, R.I., and, later, at our headquarters in New York, the plan is to give choreographers, composers and designers the time to work out their ideas and if they have that mysterious thing, if they have something to say, this is the opportunity provided them in which to say it. It doesn't always work out. But it might. And the 'might' is worth all the expense and the effort."

This summer, at Mrs. Harkness' arts center in Rhode Island—a firehouse converted into two large studios, other studios in her own house, a complete inn for the many married couples in her troupe—the creative opportunities for a wide range of artists are being given the time and the release that Mrs. Harkness believes are the right of the potential holder of talent.

Donald McKayle (represented choreographically on Broadway in "Golden Boy") is working on a new ballet with an Israeli theme; Sophie Maslow is restaging her successful "The Dybbuk;" Alvin Ailey, who has already created two successful works for the Harkness Ballet, is at work on "Macumba," with a score by Mrs. Harkness herself; and the Henry Street Playhouse's Alwin Nikolais is moving out of his own distinguished home for a rare occasion to create a new work for the Harkness Ballet.

Other choreographic highlights of the summer workshop at Watch Hill include a new version, by John Butler, of "Gian Carlo Menotti's Sebastian;" Mr. Saddler's new American Indian ballet, "Koshari," with a score by the Indian composer Louis Ballard; a piece by Mr. Skibine to a new score by Carlos Surinach; Stuart Hodes' "Free for All," to music of Paul Bowles, and other ballets by Mr. Saddler (an Alice in Wonderland Through the Looking Glass piece), William Dollar, Leon Fokine, Karoby Barta, Richard Wagner and others.

The ambitious program—the Workshop at Watch Hill, Harkness House in New York, a second Harkness Ballet tour of Europe in 1965-66, a Rebekah Harkness Foundation Dance Festival in Central Park this fall—are but a part—albeit major—of the Harkness plans. "I think it's important," says the slim, supple (she takes ballet class and yoga exercises daily), youthful mother of three grown children, "to help dancers develop secondary talents. Why should dancers have to fear that awful moment when the muscles just won't do the job any more? I'd like to see them ready with another skill—maybe design, perhaps music, teaching, therapy—which will extend their earning capacities for many years."

A long-range project has to do with men in the ballet. Mrs. Harkness recognizes the fact that dancing for men is subjected to the incontrovertibly erroneous notion that dance is a feminine art but, more important, that the all-American "pop" is worried that his son won't make a dependable living. For this outmoded attitude, Mrs. Harkness has a campaign in mind.

"My idea," says Mrs. Harkness, "is to send lecture-demonstration programs out to as many schools as possible. Whom do we want for male dancers in American ballet? We want the types you find in high school gymnasiums. We need to win them over at that vulnerable age—and their parents, too. For these boys from our gymnasiums, given the training, can do anything that the Bolshoi Ballet wonder kids can do.

"And, I guess, this brings us back to where we started, my function. I'm a composer and I work at it hard. I'm also a sculptor—I've got a figure, in the next room, with all its muscles lying about and I'd better get 'em into place—but my own foundation and Bill Harkness' foundation have set out to help ballet in America. Mistakes will be made, that is inescapable. But the artists of the ballet have, over the years, brought so much to us that I feel that my job is to bring to them—in time, in opportunity, in release, in encouragement, in financial help and stimulating surroundings—what I can."

A GI'S LAST LETTERS FROM VIETNAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in view of our reaffirmed commitments in Vietnam and in light of the great need for a national dedication to our cause on that battlefield, I ask that an article appearing in Family Week be inserted in the Record at this point. It is entitled "A GI's Last Letters From Vietnam," and it is composed of excerpts from the letters of Capt. James P. Spruill to his family. These were wonderful letters—letters expressing the very best of the American spirit—letters showing a deep sense of responsibility and a strong hope for our cause. Before being killed in Vietnam, Captain Spruill said:

Progress will not be dramatic. It will, in fact, be painfully slow. One of our biggest enemies will now be impatience and despair itself. . . . Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty, and of victory—for we must and we can win.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A GI'S LAST LETTERS FROM VIETNAM

(NOTE.—On Memorial Day, a widow shares her pride in a husband who went to a war-torn land where his beliefs were put to the ultimate test—but never faltered.)

Mrs. Barbara Spruill, Suffern, N.Y.: "On April 22, 1964, I was at my sister's house, when the telephone rang. I could hear her talking: 'Yes, she's here. . . . Read it to me. . . . Yes, I'll tell her.'"

"She didn't have to tell me, though—I sensed that a telegram had been delivered to my home; a neighbor, guessing its contents, had phoned my sister.

"My husband, Capt. James P. Spruill, had been killed the previous day in Vietnam. I learned later that his jeep had struck a land mine.

"Our daughter, Elizabeth, 4, cried when I told her that daddy would not come home. But our son, Mark, 7, understood and was a great comfort to me.

"After the children were in bed, I took Jim's letters and sorted and typed them until the early-morning hours. I had a reason. Some of the people who sympathized with me felt that Jim had died without cause, that I had been widowed and my children left fatherless by a senseless death. We never believed this. Jim was a selfless man dedicated to a great responsibility—a responsibility to his country and to other people. He loved the Vietnamese and, as you shall see, never doubted that the good he could do outweighed the risks he faced.

"On this Memorial Day, I wish to share our pride in Jim's sacrifice with you. Here are excerpts from some of his letters."

It is a privilege to work with the Vietnamese (self-defense corps). Frustrating at times because he is backward, poorly trained, and—generally speaking—an amateur at almost everything he does. But in spite of his faults he is the most genuine and kind human I have met. Simple, humble, willing, and warm—they are wonderful people. If the press judges them harshly at times, it would be well to remember that they have had their independence only 9 years, and they never have had the opportunity to develop leadership, civic and otherwise.

It was brought to my attention last night that we were once inadequately equipped and poorly trained and that professional soldiers came from afar to aid the fledgling American Army in its fight for freedom and internal order. Two of these "advisers" are well known—Von Steuben and Lafayette. It is heart-warming to think that we now continue the tradition of sacrifice fostered by those two men when they aided a nation in need.

The other day (during a hazardous field operation) when I thought I would drop, never to get up again, I said to myself: Barbara and the children are at the far-tree line. Without that thought I may not have made it. Later on in the day, I crossed a stream over my head. When you come to them, there is nothing to do but hold your breath and walk under (the water) and hope that you hold out until your head comes up again. And later on in the day, I fell into a spike trap. I was lucky because there were no spikes.

My rotation date back to the States is November 3, 1964. I am told that it could be as much as a month earlier but not to bank on that. In any event, Honey, the clock is running; I am where my destiny has led me, and I have no regrets except my painful absence from you, Billy Goat, and Punky Bear.

Well, little monkeys, by the time another letter gets to you, Christmas will be there. God alone knows how hard Daddy will reach

August 4, 1965

18687

out for you all in his heart during that time. In a way it will be a sad Christmas. But only in a selfish way. In a better, more meaningful way, it will be one of our best Christmases, for our little family is giving of itself to the world. We are sacrificing, you and I, for the good of other people, and that is truly Christlike.

Last night, on Christmas Eve, I went down town to a Catholic service. There were children everywhere, and there was a Santa Claus, slant eyes and all. I saw a small child that reminded me of another child I know, and it was all I could do to keep smiling. But you know, the mother read what was in my eyes and brought the child over to me. I picked it up, sat it in my lap and held it, and for a wonderfully warm moment East and West were one in heart.

It was a wonderful Christmas. I want you to understand that. Before I fell asleep, I had to cry a little. But even as I did so, I knew I did not cry out of sorrow or self-pity. I cried because my heart was so full of happiness and gratitude that it could not hold it all. I was sublimely happy because I have had the three of you.

However, my post is a bit quieter than others. Last night, for example, we showed a movie in the market and that helps keep things quiet because the local VC (Vietcong) like to see the movies, too. Strange thing to sit there in the night, a pistol in your hand, and laugh at animated cartoons with members of the VC.

At the moment, the war does not go well. You read enough about that. I feel that there is too much talk of despair. I warned you of that before I left. You may remember. Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit. And it is a war which can be won no matter what present circumstances are. For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy. We must stand strong and unafraid and give heart to an embattled and confused people. This cannot be done if America loses heart.

At the moment, my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please don't let them, back where you are, sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. Talk instead of steadfastness, loyalty, and of victory—for we must and we can win.

I must admit that there are many moments of frustration in Vietnam. Ineptness, dishonesty, lack of spirit, confusion, and laziness—to name only a few. But that is exactly why we are here. It is exactly in places and in circumstances such as this that communism gains its foothold. Communism is the scavenger of the upheaval that comes with the modernization process and the age of rising expectations.

*** Much sweat—and I am afraid much blood—remain to be shed. Progress will not be dramatic. It will be in fact be painfully slow. One of our biggest enemies will now be impatience and despair itself ***

(His last letter, dated April 19, 1964) *** Chin up. See you later ***

(Editor's Note.—Mrs. Spruill has not let her husband's sense of responsibility die. By personally writing U.S. pharmaceutical firms, she arranged for free medical supplies to be sent to Cai Son, the village where Captain Spruill was last stationed.

Last month Mrs. Spruill was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation "in recognition of her husband's supreme sacrifice in Vietnam and of his resolute and reverent support of the ideals of American patriotism as exemplified in his letters.")

"NEWSCASTER WITH THE FACTS" (JOSEPH McCaffrey) URGES PASSAGE OF THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Joseph McCaffrey, a newscaster in the Washington area, has a reputation for being a "newscaster with the facts." He is one of the finest reporters of the news in television, and has acquired a large following among those who have become acquainted with his nightly telecasts.

On Friday, July 23, 1965, and Thursday, July 29, Mr. McCaffrey broadcast two fine editorials on the cold war GI bill over channel 7 in Washington. Although the GI bill has received editorial commentary from across the Nation, Mr. McCaffrey presents the need for this bill in a perspective which is seldom reported on in the area he covered, that of our national goals and military involvement.

To illustrate the excellence of Mr. McCaffrey's commentaries and to emphasize the need for the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that the texts of these two telecasts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the telecasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Joseph McCaffrey, July 23, 1965)

One of the strangest things in Washington has been the news blackout on the cold war GI bill.

Little or nothing had been written about this bill before the Senate on Monday, finally approved the bill which Texas Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has been pushing for so long. Since Senate passage not much more has been written about it. Actually, there is no conspiracy to put the blanket over the cold war GI bill. The thunder of silence that greets it is probably in keeping with the general neglect of the peacetime draftee, yet he goes into the shooting war in Vietnam, or may be shot at in the Dominican Republic or, perhaps, be shot at in some part of the world where at this very moment there is no shooting, but soon may be. The Yarbrough bill, passed on Monday, would fill the gap left by the expiration of the Korean war GI bill. The next step is up to the House of Representatives. Although there is no inclination on the part of editors and commentators to push the cold war GI bill, there is a huge lobby forming to support it: The thousands and thousands of veterans who would benefit from it, but most important it has something else behind it: public conscience, which recognizes that we must provide for the men who are now being sent into combat.

It is this, in the end which will force action on the Yarbrough bill in the House of Representatives.

(By Joseph McCaffrey, July 29, 1965)

Now that we frankly talk of the situation in Vietnam as a war, and we double the draft quotas, with the possibility that it may be tripled within a short time, it is time to get a small beam of light focused on Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH's cold war GI bill. The Senate has already approved this bill, the House has given no indication that it is interested. Yet we are moving to a wartime footing.

We are stepping up the draft calls, as we did when we started the long haul in Korea, but the men who went into Korea knew that if they could come out alive, they would have the same GI bill benefits which veterans of World War II received.

The draftee going into the war in Vietnam doesn't have this going for him, nor will he

be able to carry over into civilian life a GI insurance program, because there is no longer any GI insurance.

The draft has been called, by those who have studied it, basically unfair. There have been, and there probably will continue to be some loopholes through which thousands will escape.

But what about those who are caught up in the draft?

What does the House of Representatives intend to do about them?

What action does the House and its Veterans' Committee intend to take on the Yarbrough GI bill?

It can no longer be called a cold war GI bill because the draftees going into Vietnam are taking part in a hot war.

If we are such a prosperous, fat, happy Nation with, as the President bragged yesterday, an unequaled 52 months of prosperity, we should be able to afford to treat our servicemen fairly and decently.

Whether we do or not, depends on what the House does about the Yarbrough GI bill.

QUIET VICTORIES ON THE FARM FRONT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, in the midst of great national and international crises, our country has experienced a series of quiet victories on the farm front. This was made very clear when the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, spoke earlier this week to the annual meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association in Columbia, Mo.

I am bringing to the attention of the Senate this fine speech for it tells so well the great success story of American agriculture in the 1960's. As Secretary Freeman points out, the Missouri Farmers Association operates "from the premise that what is good for the farm families of Missouri and the Nation is good for the Missouri Farmers Association." Certainly, MFA deserves our high praise for benefiting both the farmer and the consumer alike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, STEPHENS COLLEGE AUDITORIUM, COLUMBIA, MO., AUGUST 2, 1965

There are some experiences which—no matter how often repeated—are ever new, and revive a man's zest for life and his joy in it:

Like feeling the trusting touch of the hand of a little child;

Recognizing the voice of an old friend by the warmth of it;

Seeing the haze of loveliness that wraps itself around a mother, a wife, a daughter; and,

Seeking to match the intense concentration of an inquisitive boy.

Another of these always refreshing experiences is looking out over the versatile and vibrant farmlands of the Midwest in the midst of a growing season. There is always inspiration, accompanied by a deep sense of gratitude, in seeing firsthand the combination of farmer skills with nature's gifts that results in the miracle we know as food abundance.

So I find it good—good indeed—to be with you in this place, at this time. Thank you for inviting me.

Four years have gone by since we were last together at an annual meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association. Since 1961 I have come to know the membership of this organization better than I did then—many of the more than 150,000 of you personally—all of you through the quality of your organization and the character of the leadership you chose for it.

These associations and observations have led me to two conclusions about the Missouri Farmers Association.

One is that you do not accept progress as inevitable. You look upon progress as a process demanding imagination and creativity * * * sensitivity and sensibility * * * anticipation and dedication * * * and plain hard work.

The other is that you consistently operate from the premise that what's good for the farm families of Missouri and the Nation is good for the Missouri Farmers Association. I've seen you apply this principle internally, as you weighed possible immediate advantages for your cooperative enterprises against the potential for long-term gains and in the whole of agriculture; and I've seen you apply it in helping create and implement national farm and food policies and programs.

For establishing and following these commendable standards, you have my admiration and respect.

This organization's spirit and its concept of proper priority—as well as the personal philosophy and abilities you have recognized for a quarter of a century—have contributed to making your Fred Heinkel an internationally recognized agricultural leader.

Fred Heinkel holds the dual role of an architect, and a builder, in the food and agriculture policies and programs of the 1960's.

Few commodity programs, now or in the past, have records of performance and popularity equalling that of our present feed grains program. It was the first big step in bringing farm production policy into harmony with the era of abundance. The chairman of the advisory committee which played a major part in the creation of the feed grains program, and in perfecting it through the years since 1961, was Fred Heinkel.

Fred, I want MFA members to know that no one has done more for American agriculture through this period of almost 5 years than you. And if you will accept a personal tribute, I want to express my own high regard and warm affection.

Earlier I recalled it has been 4 years since I attended an annual MFA meeting. At that time we discussed what needed doing in the decade of the 1960's to correct inequities that were denying parity of income opportunity to our farm families and threatening the destruction of the free enterprise family farm system.

Since then, working together, we have corrected, and we have innovated.

We have broadened the avenues of economic, educational and social opportunity for the people of rural America—farm and nonfarm.

By combining the abilities, the knowledge, the resources and the purposes of people and government we have moved steadily upward on a number of fronts from the low levels of 1960.

As Al Smith once said: "Let's look at the record."

Farm earnings today are substantially better than they were. Realized net farm income in this year of 1965 is now expected to total \$13.5 billion—the highest since 1953 and some \$1.8 billion more than our farm families earned in 1960.

Today's income is better than that of 1960 because we've succeeded in moving to more

equitable farm price levels. In the early summer of 1960 the average return to farmers from soybeans was \$1.94 a bushel. This year it was \$2.72—78 cents a bushel more.

Here are some other early summer of 1960 and 1965 comparisons:

Corn: \$1.09 a bushel, then \$1.30 now.

Hogs: \$16.20 a hundredweight then, \$22.70 now.

Cattle: \$21.70 then, \$23 a hundredweight now.

Lambs: \$20.10 then, \$25 a hundredweight now.

Wool: 45 cents a pound then, 49 cents a pound now.

All hay: \$15.90 then, \$20 a ton now.

Farm spending is better than it was. The income gains are reflected in improved rural town and city economies as sales of goods and services to farmers trend upward. Last year, when gross farm income was \$4 billion over the total of 1960, farmers increased their expenditures for automobiles by over \$600 million and boosted other expenditures for capital goods and machinery by another \$400 million. Better living on the farm means better living in St. Louis, Kansas City, Detroit, and Rock Island.

Food is a better bargain than it was. For the millions of American consumers, food is the best buy they find in retail stores. This year, for the average family, food costs will take about 18.3 percent of income after taxes. In 1960, food required 20 percent—and the diet contained less beef. If the same percentage of income were being spent for food in 1965 as consumers were spending in 1960, they would have \$7 billion less to spend on other things.

Food distribution is better than it was. We're doing a much-improved job of making our food abundance cover the whole of our society—our families requiring public assistance, and our school children. The USDA's food programs are now reaching over 40 million American adults and youngsters each year. The volume of food distributed through these domestic programs has increased from 900 million pounds in 1959-60 to 2.1 billion pounds in 1964-65. In addition, a growing volume of food is moving into the homes of low-income families through commercial channels under the food stamp program.

Farm exports are better than they were. Sales of agricultural commodities overseas are expected to reach a new record of \$6.1 billion in the current fiscal year. It will be the second year in a row with farm exports in excess of \$6 billion, as compared with \$4.5 billion in fiscal 1960. This means more than better markets, better incomes, for farm families—it means expanded job and income opportunities in the areas of processing and shipping—and it makes a substantial contribution to a favorable balance of payments. From a humanitarian standpoint and from a commercial standpoint the expanded utilization of American food and fiber abroad contains the greatest opportunity for maximum use of our great food production plant. In this effort there is need for the facilities and the skills of our cooperatives, and the interest demonstrated by MFA is most welcome.

The supply-demand relationship is better than it was. Surpluses are down. Carry-over stocks of grain by the end of the year will be at the lowest level since the mid-1950's, which means greater farm price stability and a cut in storage and handling costs for taxpayers.

We can take pride and satisfaction in these achievements.

What we've done in the past 4 years is proof it is possible to base a reasonable, progressive, serviceable food and agricultural policy on a concept of abundance rather than scarcity, benefiting producers and consumer alike.

That doesn't mean we have achieved full

parity in income opportunity for our adequate, commercial family farms or that rural America as a whole is moving ahead in job and other opportunities as rapidly as it must to reach our goal of parity of opportunity.

But we're on the right track.

Whether we stay on it depends upon the decisions the Congress makes this month on legislation that will make it possible to continue—with a variety of improvements—the policies that have provided fuel for the steady progress made since 1960.

Let me emphasize that these legislative proposals are not designed to maintain the status quo. While incorporating the dynamic parts of our past experience, the omnibus farm bill is designed to encourage development of an agricultural plant and a family farm economy that will respond to the potentials of the future.

The same mechanisms that made things better than they were are not necessarily sufficient to make them better than they are.

Enactment of forward-looking legislation is mandatory to a forward-moving rural economy, a forward-moving national economy.

Failure to act will be catastrophic to both.

Studies made by the Congress, by university economists, and others agree that if we fail to extend our farm commodity programs we will quickly experience a decline of as much as 50 percent from the current, still inadequate net farm income level.

Anyone can understand a 50-percent pay cut, and its impact upon the individual family directly affected. But let me turn your attention, and the attention of the entire Nation, to what such a blow to the farm economy would mean to the whole of the country's economic well-being.

A quick look at the farm credit situation is most revealing:

On January 1, 1965, the total farm debt amounted to \$36 billion. That's 45 percent more than it was just 5 years ago. It is nearly 200 percent over the farm debt total of 1950.

It is a matter of deep, personal concern to the farm families who owe it. It should also be a matter of both humanitarian and economic concern to nonfarmers, because if farm families cannot pay it, city families are going to be in trouble, too.

The debt situation in agriculture is neither better, nor worse, than in other sectors of the economy. Farm debt has increased at about the same rate as the debt of corporations, and at a somewhat slower rate than consumer debt and private non-corporate debt.

Indications are that the sharp rise in farm debt is not due to the use of credit as a substitute for income.

Rather, the increase has resulted largely from borrowing by farmers to increase the efficiency of their operations, and borrowing by young farmers becoming established on adequate family farms. And comparatively few of them are having debt difficulties so far—this fact is made clear by the excellent record made by farm lending institutions in collections from 1961 through 1964, and the near-record low levels of delinquencies and foreclosures.

If we succeed in maintaining the farm income gains of the past 4 years; if we continue our already significant progress toward full parity of income opportunity for the operators of the growing numbers of adequate family farms, the farm debt situation is not likely to cause serious difficulties for most farmers, for the communities which provide them with goods and services, or for the urban factory workers dependent upon rural markets for a substantial share of their employment.

However, a sharp decline in farm income resulting from failure to continue constructive farm and food policies and programs would, on the other hand, quickly upset the

entire rural credit structure. It would deprive farmers of the ability to borrow or to repay the massive debt load they carry today. It would mean wholesale foreclosure and liquidation. It would mean rural chaos that would quickly infect the entire economy. Once again newspapers would repeat, in headlines, the old adage that depressions are farm led and farm fed.

The times of truly great tragedy in rural America have been the times of mass foreclosures. In this community and in others across the land, scars still remain as a reminder of the last time an accelerated downgrading of the value of a man, his family, and his farm made it impossible for the family farmer to make the payments on his mortgage.

The stakes are big this month as the Congress prepares to act on the Great Society farm program. If it is enacted into law, we can look forward to steady progress, and it wouldn't be unreasonable at all to anticipate in the next 4 years a repeat of the thousand-dollar gain in realized net income per farm of the last 4 years.

But—if we fail to build upon the experience and the programs and the progress of the 1961-65 period, the outlook will be grim indeed. If failure to adopt reasonable, purposeful legislation brings a drop in net farm income from the current level down to just \$6 billion a year, every American will suffer. In that event the efficient family farm structure that now ranks among the wonders of the modern world would be wiped out. No one can predict what might replace it, but the food abundance, and fair prices consumers now accept as casually as the air they breathe would be gravely threatened.

If we fail to respond to both the responsibility and the opportunity contained in the food and agriculture bill now before our Congress, we'll appear in the coloring book of history painted thoughtless and indifferent—perhaps even ruthless.

I believe in the positive approach—and so do you, or you couldn't face up to the year-after-year, season-after-season hazards of farming.

I can sense a growing realization among all the people of our country that they have a good thing going for them in the policies and programs that give rural America stability and sound growth prospects; give urban America an abundance of good food at fair prices; and, give the hungry of the world not only a source of food, but a fountain of know-how that can improve their ability to feed themselves.

If that realization comes to flower in terms of constructive legislation this month, the prospects are excellent that the twin goals of parity of income for the adequate family farm and parity of opportunity for all of rural America can be reached by the end of the sixties.

Let's keep our wagon hitched to that star.

Life SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, *Life* magazine has this week summed up the situation in Vietnam in an editorial, "Johnson Means Business in Vietnam," which clearly outlines the nature of America's goal:

Russian communism, a generation older than Chinese, was contained in Europe by 20 years of Western force and firmness and is now beginning to look more like a version of Russian national interest than the unappeasable firebrand it once was.

The implication there is clear, but it is spelled out nonetheless. *Life* points out that Asia's Red tyrants are aging and that their successors—will be inevitably influenced by the inherited structure of their world. If they see a string

of victories behind the openings ahead, with the West in wavering retreat, they will be more revolutionary than their predecessors. If their prospect is instead one in which the rim of Asia is a strongly guarded homeland of free and prospering people, the younger Reds may choose to concentrate on their copious domestic problems and follow the Russian example of a mature revolution.

It is possible, Mr. President, to contain Red Chinese imperialism. To those who doubt this, to those who raise the dogmas laid down by military leaders about wars in Asia, *Life* has an answer:

If it is dogmas we need, America has some good ones: The belief that America has a purpose as well as interests in the world, that the purpose and the interests are not regional but global, and that American freedom cannot be protected at the cost of those whose freedom we have promised to defend. Vietnam is the place where these beliefs once more are put to the test.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from *Life* be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

JOHNSON MEANS BUSINESS IN VIETNAM

"This is really war," said President Johnson. But not a "national emergency"; that he refused to declare. A similar ambivalence marked his whole report to the people on his much publicized full-dress review of our Vietnam policy last week.

Vietnam is enough of a real war so that he has doubled the draft call to 35,000 a month and is now sending another 50,000 troops to support the deteriorating Vietnamese resistance. On the other hand, he rejected the immediate call up of reservists and saw no present need for civilian belt-tightening. Our national war aim is perhaps more resolute but still defensive: to prevent Communist domination of Asia. Unchanged also, though more emphatic, is our readiness for "unconditional discussions with any government at any place at any time." In sum, the President's prescription for Vietnam is a marked intensification of what we are already doing—i.e., more of the same.

"More" means deeper involvement in a remote and tragic land where an increasing number of Americans are in fact already dying—over 400 since February 1. Their death places have names like Phu Bai, Danang, Ban Me Thout, Kontum, Pleiku. These place names may someday be chiseled on monuments in Michigan and Kansas, under those other names, once also thought exotic, like Chateau-Thierry, Anzio, Tarawa, Pusan.

"The same" means that any further escalation of the conflict will be by steps as carefully measured as in the past. We fight, says Johnson, to force or induce a negotiated settlement, not to invite "an expanding struggle with consequences that no one can perceive." This caution, coupled with his renewed appeals for peace initiatives from other nations and from the U.N., may disarm some critics of the morality of Johnson's Vietnam policy, especially those from abroad. But while it leaves the President still in control of all the options on the escalation ladder, it does not answer certain other doubts about the practical effectiveness of that policy. Some of the Congressmen who support it do so with more fatalism than conviction. For in this kind of war, more of the same may not be enough.

"Americans do not like long, inconclusive wars. This is going to be a long, inconclusive war." The words are Ho Chi Minh's in 1962. "Son, don't ever get yourself bogged down in a land war in Asia." The words are attributed to General MacArthur on his

deathbed and often quoted by Lyndon Johnson himself. These two dogmas have implanted a seed of defeatism in the American mind.

It is part of the long-war dogma that you can't beat guerrillas without great manpower superiority, the minimum ratio being something put as high as 10 to 1. The South Vietnamese Army, decimated by casualties and desertions, is now three times the known strength (about 165,000) of the Vietcong. If American troops were to redress the numerical ratio, it would take over a million of them. Even if these troops were to pacify the entire surface of South Vietnam, so runs the long-war dogma. Ho Chi Minh's "Jungle Marxism" would go on burning underground like a mine fire.

From this glum prospect the MacArthur dogma jogs loose a positive fear: that the "bogging down" of American troops on the Asian mainland is an actual aim of Communist long-term strategy. It would drain and pin down their No. 1 enemy and clear the road for aggression elsewhere. As Walter Lippmann keeps arguing, the United States cannot police the entire world, and southeast Asia, where U.S. security is not directly threatened, is a bad place to commit U.S. power. Says Senator RUSSELL, head of the Armed Services Committee and no advocate of withdrawal, "I have never been able to see any strategic, political, or economic advantage to be gained by our involvement" in Vietnam.

These dogmas, fortunately, have not governed President Johnson's decisions.

Ho Chi Minh's guerrilla tactics are indeed successful in the countryside, but they still require him to avoid pitched battles, which he would lose against superior United States-Vietnamese firepower. They are much less useful against the big cities without which he cannot conquer South Vietnam. Moreover, Ho's accumulation of small victories has been compounded by some Pentagon errors in the conduct of this war, particularly as to timing. Because of the reluctant and creeping pace of our commitment, we have generally opposed Ho with too little and too late.

The U.S. commitment in Vietnam is much deeper now. Our men already have combat missions which they are rapidly learning to make more effective. The buildup of five major bases, toward control of the entire east coast, is of dimensions not seen in Asia since the Korean war. The air raids on North Vietnam have many scores of richer targets on their agenda before the possibility of Chinese intervention (or more Russian aid) need deter us. Ambassador Lodge resumes his post with ideas for a new program than can rekindle both the villagers' military resistance and their political hope.

As for Communism's grander strategy, it is of course impossible for the United States to fight tyranny at all times and in all places. But it is perfectly possible to contain Red Chinese imperialism if we so decide.

Russian communism, a generation older than Chinese, was contained in Europe by 20 years of Western force and firmness and is now beginning to look more like a version of Russian national interest than the unappeasable firebrand it once was. The Communist tyrants of Asia are now old men—Mao Tse-tung, 71; Ho, 75—soon to be succeeded by a new generation. The strategies of this generation will be inevitably influenced by the inherited structure of their world. If they see a string of victories behind the openings ahead, with the West in wavering retreat, they will be more revolutionary than their predecessors. If their prospect is instead one in which the rim of Asia is a strongly guarded homeland of free and prospering people, the younger Reds may choose to concentrate on their copious domestic problems and follow the Russian example of a "mature" revolution.

However that may be, this is no time for defeatism about Asia. China is not, either

now or inevitably, a superpower dominating her neighbors; only their fear, induced by American withdrawal, could make her so. The President refuses to speculate whether the Vietnam war will last for "months—or years—or decades," and such speculation is indeed bootless until our new commitment there has shown its military results.

If it is dogmas we need, America has some good ones: the belief that America has a purpose as well as interests in the world, that the purpose and the interests are not regional but global, and that American freedom cannot be protected at the cost of those whose freedom we have promised to defend. Vietnam is the place where these beliefs once more are put to the test.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am proud to endorse the resolution introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, establishing August 4 as U.S. Coast Guard Day in commemoration of the 175th birthday of this great armed force and humanitarian service.

The Coast Guard has always been of great personal interest to me. Four months prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor I enlisted in the Coast Guard, my first duty being that of ships' cook. At the end of the war I held the rank of Lieutenant and have now the honor of being a captain in the Coast Guard Reserve.

In the State of Rhode Island, we have long been aware of the beneficent presence of the Coast Guard. We know of its unceasing efforts to provide a greater measure of safety to all who travel on or over the sea. Its extensive lifesaving network has saved many thousands of lives and billions of dollars in property. Thousands of Rhode Island boatmen have been the beneficiaries of the Coast Guard's work. In the past year alone, the Coast Guard was responsible for saving or rescuing from peril more than 130,000 persons and the value of ships and cargo saved was nearly \$1 billion or approximately two and one-half times the Coast Guard's annual budget. That is a very good return, indeed, for the American taxpayer's dollar.

Besides serving the noble cause of safety at sea, the Coast Guard is hard at work expanding our knowledge of the sea upon which our future survival may depend. Its highly trained port security organization stands ready to protect our waterfronts and harbors from hostile action in the event of emergency, and its approximately 32,000 officers and enlisted personnel maintain themselves in a state of constant military readiness to serve with the Navy should the need arise.

Several weeks ago, the Coast Guard demonstrated its readiness to respond to emergencies by dispatching, at the Navy's request, 17 of its 82-foot patrol boats to help counter North Vietnamese efforts to supply Communist Vietcong units in the Republic of Vietnam.

As our country's oldest, continuous, seagoing military service, the Coast Guard has the distinction of having taken part in every major war in which our Nation has been engaged. In World War II, the Coast Guard's men, ships and planes gave an excellent account of

themselves in every theater of operation. Many a Coast Guardsman never returned to his home and loved ones. Some lie buried in lonely graves in the oceans of the world. They have left us a heritage of valor which will never be forgotten.

For myself, I remember with pride that, in 1957, the Coast Guard cutter *Spar* returned to her home port of Bristol, R.I., after completing the first circumnavigation of the North American Continent by an American vessel. This was a significant event in the history of navigation. By her action, the *Spar* fulfilled the dream of navigators since the time of the Cabots to find an eastward passage across the top of the continent.

Along with my fellow Americans I say: Congratulations Coast Guard on your 175th birthday. The prayers and best wishes of the American people go with you for many additional years of rewarding service to country and humanity.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS WILL USE YOUTHFUL COMMITMENT AND SERVICE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, a few days ago Vice President HUMPHREY delivered a moving address to young Government interns at the annual meeting of the White House seminar. He praised this new generation for restoring the excitement of dialog and questioning to America's college campuses.

Large numbers of young people now are active in campus intellectual ferment, unselfish in commitments to social justice, and willing to devote productive years to service. These youthful qualities, the Vice President concludes, create the climate for such national efforts as the Peace Corps, VISTA—and now the National Teacher Corps.

In view of the timeliness of this excellent assessment of the state of America's young people, I feel all Members of the Congress should have an opportunity to read it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am honored to be with you this morning at the annual meeting of the White House seminar.

I have had the privilege of meeting with this group for each of the past 3 years.

First, let me say that we are pleased to have your services, if only for one summer. Even in so short a time you can make significant contributions here in Washington. And I think you will gain, too—if only from seeing just how things work here. I hope you will put this experience to good use. At the risk of sounding like a commencement speaker, I will say that your generation faces great tasks and that you will need all the experience and knowledge you can get.

We are surrounded today by a technology which is still in its infancy.

Information is already running ahead of our ability to use it.

International political crises can develop and involve the entire world in the time it used to take for an ambassador to a small country to draft his longhand report on a local uprising.

Two-thirds of the world is poor and seeking to break through, by whatever means, to something better.

We have wealth and power to do great work—or to destroy ourselves.

The point I want to make this morning may seem self-evident. But it bears repeating.

The point is this: That this Nation and world will survive and prosper only if individual man can control the great forces moving about us.

As society becomes increasingly complicated—and, therefore, by necessity, increasingly organized—there is danger of losing sight of the individual.

It is precisely in such a complex society that the individual's needs are greatest. And it is in such a society that we need men and women able to exercise individual judgment and to take individual initiative.

That is why this administration is committed to giving each child entering life full, equal, and free opportunity for personal fulfillment, while at the same time providing for the general welfare.

We seek to create an environment where each American can contribute to and share in the betterment of the human condition. We seek to create an environment in which each man may and will be able to do something for all men. This is the goal of the Great Society.

But we will not reach that goal by government initiative alone. It will only be reached, finally, by the commitment, involvement, and action of individual Americans, each working where he is.

Is our American society today a society of individual involvement? Or is it, as some have charged, a society of individual alienation?

The test is what is happening around us—by the signs and symptoms. I think the signs and symptoms are positive. I think they give us reason for hope and confidence concerning the fate of individual man as well as our society in general.

There is no question, in fact, in my mind that your generation is indeed a generation of involvement.

The best example of this is seen in activity and ferment on campuses across our country. This should not be cause for worry. What is happening indicates that the excitement of dialog and questioning has returned to the campus.

It was not so long ago that we had a college generation of apathy and complacency—a generation of people who simply didn't care about much except their own comfort and security, a generation moved by the herd instinct. But apathy and complacency are not the mark of your generation.

The fact is that more and more young Americans are devoting their productive years to service.

Some people call this "do-goodism." But let me say that I pray the day never comes in our country when a man's best efforts to aid his fellows—to "do good"—are rejected.

Our young people are not selfish. The young people of America know that life is better for them than it was for their parents. They know for certain that it is much better than it was for their grandparents. But they are not saying to themselves and others, "Let's just keep it for ourselves."

This generation, the President has said, may well become known as the volunteer generation.

More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps. More than 3,000 have already returned. And more than 100,000 have asked to participate in this bold and idealistic experiment.

When VISTA—the volunteers in service to America—was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

These were volunteers for jobs without great financial reward, for hard and often thankless service.

credit on Larry O'Brien and the White House. Larry O'Brien is known to all of us here in Congress as a skilled tactician but a most reasonable and understanding man. He has always been willing to listen to the other man's point of view while carefully explaining the White House point of view to Members. Larry O'Brien always remembers that he is dealing with elected Members of Congress, sent here by the voters, and not appointed government officials. He has always understood the responsibilities that House and Senate members have to the electorate. This is one of the reasons why he has been so successful on Capitol Hill and why he is so genuinely liked and respected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have William S. White's column entitled "O'Brien's Contribution," printed with my remarks, at this point in the RECORD: JOHNSON PROGRAM—O'BRIEN'S CONTRIBUTION (By William S. White)

There are two incredible realities about President Johnson's program in Congress, and it is a close question as to which is the more improbable.

One is the profound and unexampled scope of the legislation that has moved so sedately and surely through the Senate and House. What Congress under Mr. Johnson's spur is doing in all fields of social legislation is in depth and total meaning beyond what any Congress has ever done for any President in any like period—not excluding Franklin D. Roosevelt at the top of his power.

The other unreal reality is that all this is being accomplished with so quiet, so casual, an air of professional competence that the country is hardly aware of the immense alterations being made in the whole fabric of its collective life.

Five enactments of historic significance have already followed one another in orderly and ordained sequence, as steadily and calmly as a trained squad of men filing by in quickstep. Four of these—aid to the Appalachian region, Federal assistance to education in a fundamental way, medicare, and Negro voting rights—had been in one way or another sought for decades—for 2 to 3 decades in some instances, for 10 decades in the case of civil rights.

A fifth, the measure not merely to broaden Government-aided housing but also to provide Government rent subsidies to tenants, is so far-reaching as never before to have been proposed at all.

In any Congress one had known in the past any one of these huge bills would have provoked a struggle to shake the very walls of the Capitol. This time, each one has gone forward in about the atmosphere of strife and drama a postman might stir in making his rounds in the suburbs.

Perhaps history will have to determine the ultimate degree of wisdom or unwisdom in these unprecedented congressional actions. Some onlookers, including this onlooker, will not wait so long. They cannot down grave anxieties as to whether we ought to have gone so far so quickly in some of these many directions. Anyhow, we have gone there.

So, how was it all done? Primarily, of course, it was done by an occupant of the White House whose skill in leading and prodding Congress is matchless in our time. But the White House shelters more than one man; and the No. 2 man in this performance is entitled to a great share of credit or blame.

This No. 2 man is Lawrence O'Brien, the President's principal agent in liaison with Congress, and before that, a member of what the eggheads around President Kennedy were pleased to call, with a certain condescension, "Kennedy's Irish Mafia." O'Brien, who loved

Mr. Kennedy quite as well as the next fellow, also loved the causes and the country he was supposed to represent. So those causes and that country—and President Johnson, too—he has served with signal loyalty and high competence. If the record of the first session of the first Johnson Congress is extraordinary—and all can agree on that much, at least—extraordinary has been O'Brien's contribution to it.

No man has so ably embodied the transition from the Kennedy to the Johnson era. And no man has done his full duty with less cocktail circuit posturing and self-promotion. The reason is not dreadfully hard to find. O'Brien is a true professional; he is concerned with results and not with doctrinal hairsplitting and ideological hissing matches.

And so nobody has had to draw him a little map of the trails through that tough terrain where the bureaucratic jungle merges with the legislative jungle up on Capitol Hill.

MILITARY MEN PERFORMING CIVILIAN TYPE WORK IN THE ARMED SERVICES

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there are today at least 50,000 active-duty military men in our armed services performing civilian-type work who could and should be moved into combat units. These are in addition to those undergoing training or who have been rotated from overseas.

The Subcommittee on Manpower has noted in the past few years an increasing number of combat-trained military men working as carpenters, painters, chauffeurs, typists, stock clerks, statisticians, historians, and so forth. We have also been told by Department of Defense officials that the military men in these support jobs are more expensive than civil service employees. This is due to the heavy turnover and training costs of the military men.

Likewise, in view of the current crisis in Vietnam, with the need there for additional military manpower, the subcommittee members join me in urging that the administration first bolster our combat units by taking the tens of thousands of seasoned, trained, active-duty military men out of civilian-type jobs in preference to untrained military just out of civilian life. This move would not only insure immediately a stronger military posture but would also save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Hon. Norman S. Paul, indicated to the subcommittee on July 13, 1965, tentative plans to move military personnel out of civilian jobs. The subcommittee plans to closely watch this important manpower program.

President Johnson this week has requested the Secretary of Defense to review the utilization of active-duty military personnel to insure the maximum number of well-trained men for our combat forces.

Today I sent a letter to Secretary McNamara offering the cooperation of our subcommittee in this program and urging that he move ahead.

I recognize that my friend and colleague, the able chairman of the Armed

Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, Hon. MENDEL RIVERS, has final authority in this particular area of military strength; but may I also add that the Subcommittee on Manpower for years has been studying the ratio of civilian employees to military personnel in support work. We have and will continue to work with the Armed Services Committee.

I am today sending a copy of my letter to Chairman RIVERS and also a copy to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Honorable RICHARD RUSSELL.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues, now is a time for both action and cooperation by all.

GIRLS NATION

(Mr. GLENN ANDREWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, Washington today is host to some of the loveliest ladies in the Nation. Two members from most States are here today representing the Girls Nation. This is a project in citizenship sponsored by the American Legion National Auxiliary of which my State, Alabama, happens to have the president, Mrs. Walter Wilde Andrews and the director of the Girls Nation also comes from my State, Miss Dan Waite.

I am indeed glad to have visiting in Washington today also a young woman from my district, Miss Anthony. We are delighted to have them all, and it is with great pride that I welcome them to Washington.

NORTH VIETNAM SHIPPING

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the volume of free world shipping that continues to supply North Vietnam. On July 22, as the RECORD will show, I called to the attention of my colleagues that during 1964, 401 ships flying flags of the free world nations called at North Vietnam ports and that during the first 6 months of 1965, 74 additional vessels had carried cargoes to supply the enemy. I further pointed out the almost unbelievable fact that 24 of the vessels that had called at North Vietnam during 1964 have sailed into the harbors of this country a total of 75 times since January 1964.

I have just recently learned that in addition to these vessels, that have been trading with North Vietnam and also using our ports, there are two other ships that have called at the ports of both countries this year. Specifically, the *Meiwa Maru*, flying the Japanese flag, arrived in North Vietnam on February 15 and on April 18 was in Tacoma, Wash.; and the *Saronis*, flying the Greek flag, was in North Vietnam on January 25, in Wilmington, N.C., on April 21, and in Baltimore on April 26. I might add that prior to sailing to Vietnam in January,

18728

this same ship was in New Orleans on September 25 of last year.

This shipping to the enemy by our so-called friends is something that the American people do not understand. Permitting these ships to use our own ports is something that can never be satisfactorily explained.

Again, I want to point out that these are unclassified figures and that every Member of this House should take the time to inform himself of the true extent of this trade by demanding the classified reports. Some means must be found to stop this traffic that is betraying the American people.

THE "OTEPKA CASE—PART I"

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have recently called our colleagues' attention to the piecemeal release of the other body's Subcommittee on Internal Security concerning the "Otepka Case—Part I"; and actually feel that this technique may be profitable, in that it will keep the thorn festering in the side of the State Department, if we will but pay attention. Many others have joined me, including members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, for its counterpart in the other body of the Congress. The delay of the Otto Otepka case in the State Department, where it has been oftentimes postponed on the flimsiest of excuses by the Secretary himself; and particularly the appointment to a responsible foreign service post of the discredited William Weiland in the face of this injustice, has brought response from many readers throughout the country. In the meantime the paradoxical situation persists, and freedom weeps.

The second volume of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's hearings has now been released, and if one would but call upon the Government Printing Office for "No. 87265: The Case of William Weiland," certainly the sacrosanct officials who hide behind executive privilege would rescind Weiland's order and release him posthaste from the State Department, while restoring Otto Otepka to his deserved and responsible position.

Mr. Speaker, it now evolves that the State Department hearings for Otepka have been delayed an additional 2-months' period—until mid-October 1965. This dashes hopes that high authority, including the President if necessary, would clean up the State Department's security mess. Simultaneously, minimal reading of part 2 of "The Otepka Case—I" shows that security abuses persist in the State Department.

Since when does this Nation punish the truth and exonerate a man who perjures himself under oath, with additional reward of a high and responsible office?

Since when does the Attorney General affirm clearance by a special personnel board in face of additional evidence that a man has testified under oath that in

the critical days prior to the Bay of Pigs fiasco, he had seen Castro just once when, in fact, he had seen him six times?

Since when does the Department of Justice refuse to prosecute a man like Weiland who has committed the above, plus refusing to state his alias on a Federal personnel form?

Since when do we engage in politics as usual with a dangerous diplomatic battle going on halfway around the world?

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no Government employee should ever again be subjected to the harassment and indignities suffered by Otto Otepka—and others—whose only error was belief that national interest and straightforward testimony before a committee of this Congress was worth while, but purging oneself seems to be the custom in the entire daisy chain of State Department officials who ganged up to do the bidding of those in charge to protect less worthy individuals, or even an ideal. It must be the Department of State face-saving technique. Such erroneous actions include, first, unjust demotion; second, threats of assignment, and reassignment; third, unjust removal of official duties, including deprivation of files, secretarial help and office space; fourth, tapping of telephone lines at home and at the State Department; fifth, the secret shadowing of guiltless employees; sixth, induced ostracism by fellow employees ordered not to associate with Otepka; seventh, specific prohibition against communicating with the other body's Internal Security Subcommittee; and, eighth, malicious use of administrative processes in bringing false charges against an employee attempting to carry out his duties, and making these charges public in order to damage the employee's reputation.

If the administrative branch will not act, it is indeed high time that the Congress exercise true surveillance and oversight, not only in this general area, but in this specific instance.

Mr. Speaker, herewith is a letter from Mrs. Myra Finkel, of the greater Washington area, whose phone number and address are within my files, and whose permission I have to use this document which supports my above observations in a very personal way. She is the sister-in-law of a personal friend of mine, a general practitioner in Missouri, who is also a true patriot and concerned about our ship of state. I think the expose and arguments are revealing, personal and convincing. I commend deep and introspective reflection on these problems to all of our colleagues in the hope that we will act appropriately and exercise prudent judgment on the basis of information now available:

OTTO OTEPKA: THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND YOU

Some people in this country have a fleeting memory of the Otepka case, others have never heard of it, and still others in Government, who are directly involved, wished they'd never heard of it. The August issue of Reader's Digest carried the story "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka." How many Americans realize that the ordeal of Otto Otepka is really the ordeal of the American people? When the State Department bureaucrats persecute a man like Mr. Otepka, to cover up their own inadequa-

ties, this country is faced with disasters like China, Cuba, and now Vietnam.

I first became acquainted with the Otepka case when my Republican precinct chairman called me. She said "Myra, I'm offering my resignation; my husband is in trouble in the State Department, and I don't want to involve the Republican Party in my personal problems." Because of the fine work she had done, Edith Otepka was kept on as precinct chairman. However our local Republican officeholders from the county chairman to our Republican Congressman have done nothing to help the Otepkas. Because of my friendship with Edith my involvement in the case became a personal thing.

In the summer of 1963 Edith and Otto went to St. Louis to enroll their daughter in Washington University. The State Department brought out charges shortly after they returned. I remember wondering if I should call Mrs. Otepka to see if there was anything I could do to help them. I called their neighbor, to see if they had returned home. Marcia said "Yes, they were home and everything looked normal over there." I then called Edith, on the pretext of seeing if she had contacted my brother-in-law in St. Louis. She hadn't had time to reach Barney, but thanked me for calling and offering my help.

When I asked what the case involved, Edith replied, write the U.S. Government Printing Office and request No. 87265—"The Case of William Weiland." This is how without even meeting Otto, I came to read over a thousand pages of Senate Internal Subcommittee hearings. Maybe it was just a trick of fate that I am an avid reader and also wondered what really happened in Cuba. Or maybe, as Edith feels, because of her deep religious convictions, it was the will of God. After reading the hearings, I came to have the same high regard for Otto that I had for Edith. To this day, I consider them two of the finest people I have ever known. Anyone who reads these hearings or the new hearings on "The Otepka Case," will see clearly that Otto is a dedicated American, whose only crime was telling the truth to a Senate committee. What made this such a crime was the fact that his superiors evaded answering some questions and told downright lies in reply to other questions.

Almost 2 years have passed since the State Department brought their charges against Otto Otepka. He has been reported fired, pending his appeal. In real language this means, he goes to work every day, but is only given routine clerical work to do. Meanwhile the Nation feels the loss of a man J. Edgar Hoover once called one of the finest and most knowledgeable security officers in the history of the State Department. Only a man who knows he is right could have stood the harassment meted out by the "Foggy Bottom" bureaucrats. Harassment including bugging his phone, changing locks on his safe in front of his former staff, and transferring or punishing those who would dare to testify in his behalf.

Meanwhile back at the house, there have been men watching the family with binoculars from a car parked across the street. Violins and strange noise played through their phone. Even I got calls with one no one there when I picked up the receiver. My "Mr. Nobody," as Edith and I came to call him, started ringing me up after I wrote a letter in Otto's behalf to the Washington Star, in November 1963 (see enclosure). After I wrote this letter, Edith and Otto came to my home to thank me, this was the first time I met Otto Otepka face to face. He didn't impress me as a mutilator of documents, a conspirator, or a man who would exhibit conduct unbefitting a State Department official. I felt my opinion of the hearings and Otto was justified. Here was a man who clearly had the best interest of our country at heart.

cent of Pennsylvania's total production in 1964. The prospect is both gratifying and invigorating.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, America is learning that investor-owned utilities, left to their own ingenuity and imagination without Federal interference or tax-subsidized competition, are fully prepared to provide all the energy that will be needed in the next year, the next decade, and the next century. And in the process, the Nation will grow and prosper.

As a part of my remarks, I include the announcement being made jointly today by these two utilities:

THE ENERGY CENTER OF THE EAST

Plans for a multi-million-dollar interstate electric power project, including a \$140 million mine mouth generating station near Homer City between Indiana and Johnstown, were announced today by Pennsylvania Electric Co. and New York State Electric & Gas Corp.

The 1,280,000 kilowatt mine mouth powerplant would be jointly owned by the two utilities. It would consume about 3.5 million tons of coal a year, most of which would be mined adjacent to the plant and delivered by conveyor belts—with the balance to be mined within a few miles of the site.

Construction of the plant would commence next March with the first 640,000-kilowatt unit in operation by May 1969 and the second unit of the same size to be completed about 18 months later.

The plant site is in an area rich in bituminous coal deposits and about 20 miles northwest of Johnstown. It is about 15 miles southeast of the Keystone power project under construction near Shelocta and about 12 miles northwest of the contemplated Conemaugh powerplant near New Florence. The installation of the Penelec-New York State Electric & Gas Corp. plant would mean, when all three are in operation in the early 1970's, that this 30-mile stretch of central western Pennsylvania could produce over 5 million kilowatts (including Penelec's existing Seward station), one of the greatest concentrations of electric power production capacity in the world.

New York State Electric & Gas Corp.'s share of the output of the station will be delivered by a 345,000-volt transmission line that will run 170 miles from the site to the Elmira-Binghamton, N.Y., area and would be the first extra-high voltage line to tie western Pennsylvania directly with upstate New York. Penelec's share of the station output will be taken into its transmission network near the site.

Agreement to proceed with the joint construction of the plant was announced today by Penelec President Louis H. Roddis, Jr., and New York State Electric & Gas Corp. president Joseph M. Bell, Jr. The scope of the project was cited by the utility executives as "illustrating the continuing commitment and ability of investor-owned electric companies to finance and build the efficient large-scale facilities that will assure consumers in the northeast of dependable and low-cost electric service."

The New York utility serves over a half-million customers, principally in the south central portion of that State. Penelec serves 420,000 customers in about a third of the Commonwealth and including virtually the entire northern tier and in the central and southwestern parts of Pennsylvania. The Johnstown based utility is an operating company of General Public Utilities Corp. and its generating operations are integrated with its sister central public utilities companies; Metropolitan Edison Co. of Pennsylvania; New Jersey Power & Light Co. and Jersey Central Power & Light Co.

(General Public Utilities Corp. through the Jersey Central Co., is a part owner of the Keystone project and Penelec is constructing and will own portions of the east-west extra high voltage transmission lines emanating from Keystone. The general public utilities companies' power production operations are further coordinated with other eastern utilities through their participation in the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland interconnection—the world's oldest and one of the largest power pools.)

Mr. Roddis noted that Penelec's forecast of increased demand for electricity by its customers and the planned retirement of old and less efficient generating units would require Penelec to have substantial additional generating capability and that the coordinated installation of a 9-mouth extra high voltage program would meet the requirements of both utilities in 1970.

Although this project would create the first transmission tie of extra high voltage level (over 230,000 volts) between western Pennsylvania and upstate New York, Penelec and New York State Electric & Gas Corp. have maintained transmission connections at five points along the States' border for many years. In addition, New York State Electric & Gas Corp. has 11 major transmission ties with 4 other utilities and Penelec is interconnected with 7 other companies at 13 other locations.

Design details for the plant are still to be developed but would be similar in concept to the neighboring 9-mouth stations. Cooling water for the plant will be continuously recycled from huge storage basins outside the plant, sent in to the station's condensers where it will pick up heat, returned outside and into 350-foot tall hyperbolic concrete shell natural draft cooling towers and dropped back down to the storage basins.

Additional supplies of water to make up for the amounts being evaporated in the cooling process will be withdrawn from Two Lick Creek and pumped uphill to the plant site about a mile away. The creek's flow will be maintained at an adequate rate all year round for this purpose by construction of a reservoir further upstream with 13,000 acre feet of water storage impounded by a concrete dam.

The siting of the plant in the central western Pennsylvania soft coal region will allow the companies to take advantage of the substantial economies associated with using readily recoverable, run-of-the-mine coal with an average heat rate of 12,000 B.t.u. per pound and requiring minimal preparation and transportation. Studies have shown about 125 million recoverable tons of coal within a few miles of the site. The officials reported that no contracts have as yet been entered upon with coal companies.

Part of the economic impact of the project would lie in the fact that the character of the coal in the area, while suitable for this plant, is less in demand for other uses and much of it might not otherwise ever be mined. It is predicted that operation of the plant at full capacity would mean 500 or more mining jobs and a large number of trucking and other associated jobs. Installation of the plant will also mean a large number of temporary jobs and substantial local purchases of materials, supplies and services during the construction period—all of which should inject several million dollars a year of additional purchasing power into this region's economy.

Another feature evaluated in the economic analysis of the site is its proximity to Penelec's network of 230,000 volt and 115,000 volt transmission lines leading to major local electric load centers and to existing interconnections.

Mr. Roddis noted that consumers in Pennsylvania have fast been reaping the benefits of the relatively new technology of EHV

transmission and the development of large scale generating units. "This has been so," he said, "both from the standpoint of the economic impact of siting 9-mouth plants in our State and in the action of Penelec and other investor-owned electric companies to pass along the economic advantages to their customers." He noted that while Penelec had reduced rates three times in 1965 alone, and had initiated reductions totaling over \$6 million in the past 5 years, it considered the substantial investment represented by today's announcement as: "intended to help us assure our customers that electric service will remain the best bargain in Pennsylvania in the years to come."

Mr. Roddis and Mr. Bell stated also that, "our project illustrates the intention and ability of investor-owned utilities to meet the Nation's growing electric power requirements and to work toward further reduction in power costs—and to achieve these ends without placing a burden on the taxpayer."

The Hon. Robert L. Leggett
Vietnam: Facts Self-Evident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, American policy in Vietnam is really relatively simple as far as I see it. We strongly support self-determination of government by people, and whereas the issue of people popularly supporting Communist causes has never arisen, I am sure that our policy is such that we would let any people determine their own future by majority vote whether it be Communist, Socialist, or democratic.

The problem comes up when one group seeks to impose a Communist system by force in a protracted battle with outside interference. The United States will equalize by force any situation that so arises in the world.

Respecting Red China, undoubtedly she should be a member of the U.N. but so also should Nationalist China and therein lies the current conflict.

The President has again urged the utilization of the U.N. to terminate the hostilities in southeast Asia. The Communists have steadfastly refused to recognize this organization or its function in any fashion in the danger area. We have offered to talk to anybody in the world to bring this matter to a conclusion. The Communists have refused to talk with anybody. We are now in a situation where we are sending substantial troops abroad, I hope for the purpose of maintaining the status quo allowing our technological superiority to bring the Communists to the bargaining table without inflicting innumerable casualties in a large ground war.

I am pleased to see the American public gradually recognizing that the truth and facts in Vietnam are really self-evident.

The Vallejo Times-Herald in my home district editorialized on July 27 responsively and in the national interest as follows:

August 4, 1965

A4308

EVERYONE IN THE KNOW

Demands and pleas that the Government "tell the truth about Vietnam" strike a responsive chord among many Americans, whether they are voiced by persons who oppose the administration's actions or by those who support them.

Although most of us have a decided opinion about what should be done in matters of domestic concern, when it comes to foreign affairs we are usually more ready to abdicate our own judgment and look to the Government experts for answers, even while not quite trusting them.

This was pointed out recently by Gunnar Myrdal, an astute Swedish observer of the American scene.

Writing in the New York Times magazine, he gives as the reason the fact that the ordinary citizen "tends to assume that the Government has information of a secret nature, not available to the general public."

While it may be to the tactical advantage of Government officials to maintain this belief, "experience suggests that outside purely military matters the belief is vastly exaggerated when it is not entirely false."

Ordinarily, maintains Myrdal, no Government has more knowledge about a foreign country than is generally available in the press and published literature.

If so, this carries two significant implications—one general and the other particular—for all of us:

In general, it means there can be no excuse for shrugging off responsibility for what the Nation does in the world arena on the grounds that we cannot possibly know—or learn—as much about the issues as the men who have to make the decisions.

In the particular issue of Vietnam, it means that despite any fond hopes, the Government possesses no secret knowledge but for the revelation of which we could arrive at a quick and easy solution to the war there.

"The truth about Vietnam" is as evident to the ordinary citizen as it is to the man in the White House.

It is that the Communists want to swallow up South Vietnam and we intend to stop them from doing it.

It is that we face a long and increasingly costly struggle, with no certain prospect of victory or even some kind of peace that is neither victory nor defeat.

There are no hidden truths that will make these obvious truths go away.

The American resolve is further emphasized and articulated by the following editorial of Kenneth Leake in the Woodland Daily Democrat on July 31, 1965:

AS WE SEE IT: HANOI DELUSION

It has been more than a little baffling to Americans—and we suspect to citizens of a great many other nations—why Ho Chi Minh and his associates and advisers in the North Vietnam Government have shown not even a glimmer of interest in sitting down at a conference table to try to end the Vietnamese war.

The United States has tried about every diplomatic trick in the book to bring about such discussions.

President Johnson has offered publicly to hold unconditional negotiations. Various and sundry mediators, including one of British Prime Minister Wilson's ablest far-left friends, have tried to reason with the Hanoi regime.

Washington has turned on awesome military power in sustained attacks, and then turned it off. Military establishments and facilities all over North Vietnam have been bombed, while Hanoi and other major cities have been conspicuously left alone.

But nothing has worked.

Now from London come some reports which, however incredible they seem to us, may explain the indifference of Hanoi toward negotiations.

Reliable observers who have visited the North Vietnam capital in recent weeks—some western Communists, some neutrals—have returned shaking their heads in wonderment over a fixation they have found held by both officials and North Vietnamese citizens.

Not only does North Vietnam expect to win the war. From Ho on down, the North Vietnamese are flatly convinced that the United States is torn asunder by dissension on the Vietnamese war and that President Johnson is on the verge of impeachment because of his foreign policy.

Nothing the visitors could say—many of them friendly to Ho—could shake that conviction. Several of the North Vietnamese cited the revolt in U.S. colleges, and said that such attitudes were always the prelude to revolution.

This would make sense of the adamant position of Ho Chi Minh and his followers, even if the conviction upon which they are relying is utter nonsense.

But the question is, What we can do about it? How can we convey the truth of conditions in the United States—and our determination not to pull out of Vietnam—to the Hanoi regime?

Here the lack of communications between the United States and Red China and its satellites poses a real and serious problem.

Washington has its work cut out in trying to find an answer to this. And that's one of the main reasons it appears inevitable that the next few months will see a considerable buildup in U.S. military forces in South Vietnam.

The People Are the Last Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Daily News carries an editorial on the subject of legislative reapportionment and I believe it merits the attention of all.

The editorial follows:

THE PEOPLE ARE THE LAST WORD

In our system of government, as spelled out by the Constitution and every other principle we go by, the people are the final word.

But a substantial number of Members in the U.S. Senate, although generally classifying themselves as "liberals," are opposed to this system.

They demonstrate this opposition by the bitter manner in which they seek to defeat the so-called Dirksen amendment to the Constitution.

Last year, the Supreme Court, in an amazing ruling, held that both houses of a State legislature had to be apportioned on a strict population basis—the so-called one-man, one-vote proposition. This despite the State-by-State apportionment of the U.S. Senate, despite the constitutions of most States, despite recent and specific approval by the voters in some States of a different system.

Nobody wants to rip out the Supreme Court because of this airy decision, although the decision had the effect of ripping out most State legislatures.

The way to correct the Court's action is to write into the Federal Constitution an amendment. This amendment has been offered by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois. All the amendment says is that any State may set up one house of its legislature on other than a population basis if—emphasis on the if—the people of the State want it that way.

But the Senators opposing the Dirksen amendment don't want the people to decide for themselves. The plain implication is that the Senators know better than the people of the States what is a proper system for the States. Since many of these Senators have been among the most zealous champions of civil rights, their inconsistency on the Dirksen issue is beyond comprehension.

If the people in the States are not capable of deciding such basic questions as the manner in which they wish their legislatures to be organized, then it is valid to question the capacity of the people to decide other questions—who, for instance, should represent them in the U.S. Senate.

Maybe, if these anti-Dirksen Senators are right, we should go back to the old system of having U.S. Senators chosen by State legislatures. (We wouldn't favor that for a minute, but it is just as logical as the opposition to the Dirksen amendment.)

There are many arguments favoring the Dirksen amendment. But, regardless of all other arguments, the issue now before the Senate is fundamental—the right of the people of the States to decide for themselves. Despite all the windy debate, this is the only issue.

Britain Lost in Social Mist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eric Sevareid:

BRITAIN LOST IN SOCIAL MIST—ENCRUSTED ORGANIZED LABOR TRYING TO GET MORE FOR LESS

(By Eric Sevareid)

LONDON.—When I last departed England 4 years ago, a tired Tory government was in power. Now the long-frustrated Labor Party has charge and very little has changed, save that prices are higher. It is as if the country were searching and searching for the magic button that would galvanize the people and move their potentially first-class industrial complex off dead center.

It is ironic but not at all surprising that a Prime Minister ostensibly representing the working class spends his weekends making speeches insisting that the workers work harder. The faults of management are obvious enough to any American businessman who does business here; but organized labor has become ever more encrusted, bureaucratized, reactionary, and spiritless. Its energies remain concentrated on getting more for less.

POPULAR STORY

In an imaginary but popular story, Frank Cousins, head of Britain's greatest labor agglomeration and now in the Cabinet, is making a speech to his followers: "And in 15 years time," he shouts, "we will work only 1 day a week—Wednesday." Voice from the gallery: "All day?"

Two hundred atomic submarine fitters quit work over the question of whether they shall

August 4, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4329

which flayed this gallant bastion of democracy, could do little to help. All eyes turned to America, hope of humanity. It was then that the Saint again performed another miracle for his beloved Zante. The venerable Leonidas Zois, official historian of the island and for half a century keeper of the municipal archives, while sorting some singed manuscripts retrieved from the flames, came across the correspondence of Count Theodore Caesar Logothetis who headed a contingent of Zakynthian volunteers in the American Revolution. At the suggestion of Mr. Zois, Count Phokion Logothetis, an hereditary commander of the order and descendant of Count Theodore Logothetis, appealed to Dr. Pericles Voultsos of New York, scion of the Vourtzis family of Kalipado, so closely associated with the island's history, in a dramatic appeal to help the land of his fathers. Upon Dr. Voultsos' acceptance of this responsibility, he was elected Grand Master ad Vilam of this historic Order. Upon his subsequent visit to the island in 1954, he was anointed and officially installed in a resplendent ceremony at the St. Dennis' Cathedral in Zante, attended by Church, lay dignitaries, hereditary knights of the Order and Royal Government officials.

The new Grand Master sounded the clarion call to duty. The Knights of the Order, aware of their obligation, rose to the occasion. Girding themselves to the enormous task, they rallied round the unfurled battle banner of St. Dennis and in the humble spirit of Christian dedication, applied themselves to the reconstruction of the island. The results of the 12-year period of our endeavor are self-evident. Our deeds are there for the world to see, for others to follow.

Zante, Pearl of the Ionian, like the mythical phoenix reborn from the ashes of destruction, shines bright under azure Grecian skies once more. The Order of St. Dennis, this most ancient and historic order of Christian compassion and depository of chivalric heritage, is indeed proud of its contribution. The knights, heirs to a historical and sacred tradition, have proven their mettle; the humane endeavors of the Sovereign Greek Order of St. Dennis of Zante are outstanding as an example of compassion and understanding; a source of inspiration to all people in promoting the brotherhood of man. Paladins of the forlorn, ever alert for more vistas of human misery to conquer, they will always continue to serve mankind in need. These heroes of charity, representing, in this day and age, chivalry and the romantic idealism of medieval knighthood, in their dignity and extraordinary valor, are content with the good Samaritan reward and live by the Good Book. "Love ye therefore the stranger; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."

For Our Stand in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, to all those who advocate we back down in Vietnam, who believe that the price of standing up to Communist aggression in South Vietnam is too high, I commend for their deep contemplation the words which appeared in the Williamston, Mich., Enterprise on July 28, written by a young man who is actually on the firing line in this war-torn country. Ron Ea-

ton, YNSN, is serving aboard the USS *Midway*, he is not writing from a comfortable home or office in the United States. At the present time his whole life is centered on serving his country regardless of the sacrifice and he is proud of what he is doing. But his job is being made more difficult by the realization that some Americans question whether what he is doing is worthwhile.

While in Vietnam in June on an assignment for the Special House Armed Services Subcommittee, I talked with hundreds of men and everywhere I heard the same thing, our military mission in Vietnam seemed very clear to them.

I urge everyone to read the comments of this sailor who sees his duty to protect our freedom and intends to do his part to keep faith with our ideals. His letter should be an inspiration to all Americans:

DEAR SIR: I realize how busy, and I also realize that this will probably never see your paper, but, I don't know how Williamston is reacting about our actions in Vietnam, but I have heard about Michigan State University and the sit-ins and teach-ins which have been going on, and it makes me disgusted as well as the rest of the men aboard *Midway*.

I feel that these people just don't realize what they are doing, or else they are doing it just to be "part of the gang." I know, for when I was attending Williamston High School, from 1959-63, I also did things that I really didn't have reason to do, just to be part of the gang. What these people don't realize is that they are just lowering the men's morale, who are over here fighting for a cause that they believe in, and if it's one thing that we need it is morale.

I for one, and I know that many are with me, feel that this mission is of great importance to us and Vietnam. If we were to let the Communists have Vietnam, then they would feel that they were obligated to keep on going and eventually take everything that they could get their hands on, and we wouldn't do a thing about it, because they have seen us pull out, and where would the United States be placed in the minds of the people? The people of Vietnam right now have confidence, which they never had before, and they are realizing that we are there to help them, and they are doing better than ever.

At present *Midway* has been on the coast of Vietnam since April 9, 1965. We have had at-sea periods of better than 30 days each time. We have hardly had any liberty, and our morale is low. We have given air support to the Vietnamese, plus the various missions concerning bombing of bridges that are vital to the Vietcong for transportation, Communist concentrations, and many other things that I cannot mention.

So far we have been successful, but if we do not have the people behind us, we feel that we are just doing something that is no avail, but if the people would get behind us and give us some kind of support and stop all of this "hogwash" of sit-ins, teach-ins and so forth, that we could do a better job and be proud of the fact that we are the men that are keeping the freedom and liberty for our loved ones and families in the great United States of America.

I know that this is not a very well put together letter, or opinion, but at least I have got it off my mind. Maybe you can get some action from the people, I hope so.

Thank you for your most valuable time. I am

Sincerely yours,

RON EATON,

YNSN U.S. Navy, U.S.S. *Midway* (CVA-41)

Fortas and the U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, among the many things that President Lyndon Johnson and Abe Fortas, the President's nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court bench, have in common is an uncommonly short period of military service in World War II.

Lyndon Johnson jumped in and out of uniform in about 7 months. Fortas apparently made the change in considerably less time.

The "Inside Washington" newspaper column, written by the veteran correspondents, Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, sheds some interesting light on the subject. It is reproduced herewith:

INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON, August 4, 1965.—Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who will pass on Abe Fortas' appointment to the Supreme Court, are evincing much curiosity about a singular omission in his lengthy, self-written biography.

While meticulously listing every public and private job he has ever held and numerous other details, there is not a single word about his World War II Navy service.

Similarly, President Johnson, who left Congress to enter the Navy and proudly wears the Silver Star Decoration on his lapel, also was mute about the military service of his choice for a seat on the highest tribunal of the land. While glowingly acclaiming Fortas as a "scholar, profound thinker, lawyer of superior ability, humane and deeply compassionate . . . champion of our liberties," the President said nothing about his being a veteran.

In each instance, this remarkable silence was no oversight. There was very good reason for it.

Fortas' World War II naval service lasted less than 2 months—29 days of which he spent as a perambulatory patient in the hospital of a New York training camp undergoing tests and examinations.

Their verdict was that he had an "arrested case of ocular tuberculosis"—and was forthwith discharged.

Fortas immediately resumed his office as Under Secretary of the Interior.

In welcoming him back, the late Secretary Harold Ickes proclaimed that a recurrence of Fortas' eye ailment "might have been attended by the most serious permanent results." In the 22 years since then, there is no known record of such a recurrence.

In those two decades, Fortas has become a multimillionaire, the key partner of one of the largest and most influential law firms in Washington—and at 55, still does not wear glasses.

TRANSIENT APPRENTICE SEAMAN

A storm of caustic congressional and press criticism was largely behind Fortas' enlistment in the Navy on October 29, 1943.

But the 33-year-old married but childless New Dealer was barely sworn in when he was out again. On that same day, he was placed on inactive status and named head of a mission of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation to make a study of the Middle East oil situation.

Fortas explained he accepted this assignment "because it was of national importance,

A4330

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 4, 1965

and with the understanding that it would be quickly completed so (he) could enter the Navy."

A world-known newspaper reported this remarkable episode as follows:

"Abe Fortas, former Under Secretary of the Interior was in the Navy today—for a few hours.

"But almost as soon as he reported for duty as an apprentice seaman, he popped right out again * * * as the civilian head of an alphabetical Government mission to Arabia * * * to study facilities for the production and refinement of oil. Upon his return, for which no date has been set, he will report to the board of directors of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, consisting of the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior, and the head of the Foreign Economic Administration.

"Meanwhile, he will swab no decks.

"Announcement of this new assignment came just after the Navy recruiting station, asked where Fortas would be sent, had said that this was a troop movement and could not be disclosed.

"Government service has been profitable to the Fortas family. His wife, formerly an attorney in the review division of the National Labor Relations Board, is now an attorney for the Justice Department at \$5,600 a year. Her husband's induction, presumably, would cause her little hardship."

Due to transportation difficulties, the Fortas mission never left the United States.

On November 6, 1943, he again became an apprentice seaman and was sent to Camp Sampson, N.Y., for training. There he was hospitalized for a series of examinations and tests that led to his discharge December 13 for "an arrested case of ocular tuberculosis."

Upon returning to Washington, Fortas joined a veterans' organization—from which he has long since dropped out.

NO CHANGE

Mrs. Fortas (nee Carolyn Agger) has no intention of giving up her highly lucrative law practice.

A senior member of her husband's law firm, Mrs. Fortas, a leading tax specialist, heads the firm's tax division of some 50 attorneys and accountants. They occupy an office building of their own opposite her husband's office.

Says Mrs. Fortas, "I have been in the law all my life, and I don't expect to give it up now. Why should I?"

This will make her the first wife in Supreme Court history actively practicing law while her husband is on the august bench—deciding tax cases, among others.

Mrs. Fortas is a cigar smoker; short thin ones in public, large fat ones in private. Small and slim, she enjoys cooking and loves calorie-rich dishes. But she watches her weight carefully, and diets frequently to keep it down.

She and her husband are poodle lovers; now have two, Dallas and Misty.

BREAKING NEW GROUND

A multimillionaire, Fortas is the wealthiest man ever named to the Supreme Court. In addition to having the principal interest in very valuable realty holdings in a booming Washington business section, he is also an officer and director of a number of large corporations, among them Greatamerica Corp., Braniff Airways, Franklin Life Insurance Co., Madison National Bank, Federated Department Stores, Sucrest Corp. Fortas will be the first Justice to own a \$28,500 Rolls Royce, which he drives himself. Prior to his appointment, he parked it occasionally in front of his office building, a one-time mansion a block from Connecticut Avenue. A week before he was named to the bench, the Fortases bought a \$250,000, 15-room residence in Georgetown opposite historic Dumbarton Oaks, famed estate dating back to colonial times. Their new home is being extensively refurbished.

Through his long and close ties with President Johnson, Fortas has influenced a number of key appointments, foremost among them Attorney General Katzenbach and Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon Cohen, former member of the Fortas law firm. Before Fortas was named to the Supreme Court, White House insiders were saying he had been consulted by the President on former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg's selection as U.N. Ambassador. If this is true, he had a hand in opening the way for his being named to Goldberg's seat on the bench.

What Are They Afraid Of?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues which disturbs the people of this country is the question of State reapportionment.

We who have tried to have a Constitutional amendment submitted to the people have been blocked by the attitude of the so-called liberals of the Senate. They, for some reason, are opposed to letting the people express themselves at the polls. What are they afraid of?

In an editorial in the Washington Daily News, our attention is called quite clearly to the attitude of these Senators. We should let the people have the last word. To this end, yesterday I joined with the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. McCulloch, in introducing a revised proposal which I hope the Congress can and will pass and "let the people have the last word."

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 4, 1965]

THE PEOPLE ARE THE LAST WORD

In our system of government, as spelled out by the Constitution and every other principle we go by, the people are the final word.

But a substantial number of Members in the U.S. Senate, although generally classifying themselves as liberals, are opposed to this system.

They demonstrate this opposition by the bitter manner in which they seek to defeat the so-called Dirksen amendment to the Constitution.

Last year, the Supreme Court, in an amazing ruling, held that both houses of a State legislature had to be apportioned on a strict population basis—the so-called one-man, one-vote proposition. This despite the State-by-State apportionment of the U.S. Senate, despite the constitutions of most States, despite recent and specific approval by the voters in some States of a different system.

Nobody wants to rip out the Supreme Court because of this airy decision, although the decision had the effect of ripping out most State legislatures.

The way to correct the Court's action is to write into the Federal Constitution an amendment. This amendment has been offered by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois. All the amendment says is that any State may set up one house of its legislature on other than a population basis if—emphasis on the if—the people of the State want it that way.

But the Senators opposing the Dirksen amendment don't want the people to decide for themselves. The plain implication is that the Senators know better than the people of the States what is a proper system for the States. Since many of these Senators have been among the most zealous champions of civil rights, their inconsistency of the Dirksen issue is beyond comprehension.

If the people in the States are not capable of deciding such basic questions as the manner in which they wish their legislatures to be organized, then it is valid to question the capacity of the people to decide other questions—who, for instance, should represent them in the U.S. Senate.

Maybe, if these anti-Dirksen Senators are right, we should go back to the old system of having U.S. Senators chosen by State legislatures. (We wouldn't favor that for a minute, but it is just as logical as the opposition to the Dirksen amendment.)

There are many arguments favoring the Dirksen amendment. But, regardless of all other arguments, the issue now before the Senate is fundamental—the right of the people of the States to decide for themselves. Despite all the windy debate, this is the only issue.

No Surrender, No Retreat—The President at His Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1965, my hometown evening newspaper, the Nashville Banner, published an editorial, "No Surrender, No Retreat," which indicates the wide support the foreign policy of the President is receiving in Tennessee and the Nation. I include it at this point and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

NO SURRENDER, NO RETREAT—THE PRESIDENT AT HIS BEST

To the heart and mind of America President Johnson spoke yesterday—his words carefully chosen to convey the full message of unflinching decision where national duty is concerned, measuring to the challenge of Communist aggression in and from south-east Asia.

In a word, the choice is between holding there the gate against enemies of freedom—bent on conquest—and surrender. "We will not surrender," said Mr. Johnson. "We will not retreat."

It was a responsible assertion of policy enunciated clearly enough in previous public discussions, but strengthened in this reiteration by the gathering weight of muscle readiness to enforce it. It was Washington's responsibility, with advisory consultations, to formulate that policy—as it is the responsibility of Armed Forces in the field to carry it out; the latter needing only the military wherewithal and the "go" signal clearly given.

In that connection, the President stated it succinctly:

"I have asked the commanding general—Gen. William C. Westmoreland—what he needs to meet a mounting aggression. He has told me. And we will meet his needs."

The Banner has said that coherent step is essential to victory; heeding the expert evaluation of need by the man vested with that military responsibility, and backing him with the resources it will take to discharge it.

Nothing sums up this life better than a letter written by Robert Rupley, a Peace Corps volunteer killed earlier this year:

"Apathy, ignorance and disorganization are the things we want to eliminate * * * No volunteer can hope for absolute success, nor can he even expect limited success to come easily. In many ways the life of the volunteer who sincerely seeks to effect progress is miserable. That may not seem to be a very hearty recommendation for the Peace Corps, but if we as enlightened people ignore the moral and economic poverty of the unenlightened, we really slight the challenges and needs of the modern world."

The civil rights movement is surely more than anything else a product of the courage and vision of a better America held by the students who first tried to be served in a segregated public facility.

It seems a long time ago, but it was only last year at this time that the Congress responded to this moral challenge and passed the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This challenge has not gone unanswered here in Washington.

President Johnson, in two memorable speeches—first before a joint session of Congress, and again at Howard University—called for the abolition of discrimination in voting, and faced directly the deeper and more profound effects of systematic discrimination on the social and family life of the American Negro.

This Congress will shortly respond to the first of the President's calls when the voting rights bill becomes law.

But the burden of guilt and shame—a burden of every American—will not be purged until the dignity and self-respect that is the inalienable right of every citizen has been returned—returned to those Americans who have suffered for so long under second-class citizenship.

Your generation has taken this cause, has accepted it, is fighting for it.

Now, President Johnson has proposed a Teacher Corps to attract young people to the crisis areas of education.

The Teacher Corps will enable talented young people and experienced teachers to work where they are most desperately needed—in areas of chronic unemployment and poverty and the ghettos of our urban centers.

Members of the Teacher Corps will offer hope to those without hope. The Teacher Corps can offer promise that there can be a new day—with hard work and enlightened encouragement—such as is now being demonstrated in Project Head Start, which makes each young child an experiment into a better tomorrow.

Yes, this American generation has involved itself in the struggles for world peace, for equal rights, and equal opportunity, for social justice.

What does this renaissance of involvement mean?

Most importantly I believe that it signals the return of the American spirit that was described by John Adams as "one of public happiness"—a spirit, in the words of Adams, "that possessed the American colonists and won the Revolution even before it was fought * * * a spirit which is reflected in the life, in participation of public discussion and public action. The spirit of public happiness is a joy in American citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in self-discipline, in dedication."

The public business ought not to be a gloomy business. We are talking about the business of a great people essentially optimistic, outgoing, idealistic, and enthusiastic.

The spirit that John Adams talked about remains alive today.

For democracy to work, the individual must feel a responsibility for the course his

country is following, and he must know that his desires and efforts do make a difference. This generation has reaffirmed the importance of the individual in the cooperative effort of all men to improve our society.

So, as I conclude, let me salute you for your involvement in the future of your country and the world. It will be your responsibility sooner than you think.

DRURY BROWN ON AERIAL BOMBING IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Drury Brown, editor and publisher of the Blackfoot, Idaho, News, always writes with keen insight on the subject of Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have his editorial of July 20 printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Blackfoot News, July 20, 1965]

IT'S FOR THEIR OWN GOOD

One of the most disturbing stories to come out of war-torn South Vietnam was that written by Associated Press Writer John T. Wheeler and carried on the front page of the Blackfoot News Monday, July 19.

It told of how the noncombatants have become the victims of the battle that our Air Force is compelled to wage in that tortured land.

Ba Gia is a village close to the capital of South Vietnam. Theoretically, the people of the village are on the side of the government in Saigon.

But the entire populace of the area is infiltrated with an element of the guerrilla Vietcong. Perhaps a sizable portion of the population secretly hopes the Vietcong will win its war of revolution with the Saigon Government.

But the run of the mill population undoubtedly wishes to be left alone. Unfortunately, that is impossible. A government fort is nearby.

When not strongly patrolled by U.S. troops, the fort is a pushover for guerrilla attack. The Vietnamese troops flee or are slaughtered. The Vietnamese commander of the area calls for help from the U.S. Air Force. Our planes fly over the town and plaster it with bombs and napalm jelly to fire the area.

By this time the guerrillas are long gone. The only inhabitants are noncombatants. They are the ones that are blown to pieces or are incinerated by the flaming napalm.

When the Vietnamese commanders are satisfied the area has been saturated sufficiently, they move in with U.S. advisers, and if he can overcome the handicaps placed by the military, a reporter like John Wheeler or Malcolm Brown.

In his poignant report, Wheeler told of entering the smoldering ruins of a house that contained the remnants of wedding decorations. On the floor of another gutted house was a can of cooking oil with the clasped hands emblem of the U.S. Aid program.

But the inmates of the village looked at the Americans with hate in their eyes. With the innate decency of most Americans, those servicemen and observers must have cringed.

How do you convince people like these villagers that the battle we are waging for them is for their own good?

D.R.B.

SENATOR DODD'S GUN LAW HEARINGS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 1592, the gun control law

introduced by Senator Dodd, I am always interested in the comments of the press on the matter.

The Washington Post made such a comment in an editorial which appeared last Sunday, August 1, in which it commended the bill's author for the care and the detail with which he has held the hearings on this question. As the editorial notes, the bill "is not a cure-all to the dreadful situation in this country which makes possible nearly 5,000 homicides and 8,000 suicides with guns each year." But Senator Dodd certainly focused the national attention on a problem heretofore generally overlooked, not in any fanatic way but in a spirit of amity toward our sportsmen and gun collectors and all who have a legitimate use of firearms.

Such signal service deserves the kind of approbation which this editorial, and the many with which the Washington Post has preceded it, gives. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may appear in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATOR DODD'S HEARINGS

Senator THOMAS J. DODD has performed a distinctive service in the lengthy hearings on his bill to limit the mail-order sale of firearms. Both advocates of gun control and their opponents had ample opportunity to expound their views. As a result some modifications have been made, but the bill remains intact and should be promptly passed when it comes before the Senate.

The Senator's bill is not a cure-all to the dreadful situation in this country which makes possible nearly 5,000 homicides and 8,000 suicides with guns each year. It is, however, a sensible step that is rightly in the purview of the Federal Government; a step one could not imagine being blocked in the grief-filled days when the Nation discovered its President had been murdered by a weapon shipped unquestioningly to a man with a history of mental illness.

We hope Federal legislation will encourage local legislation throughout the Nation to achieve registration of all firearms and to limit the ownership of these weapons to persons over 21 who have not been convicted of a crime and who have passed a test demonstrating their knowledge of the safeguards to be observed in using firearms.

Opponents of gun legislation keep returning to the argument that it will infringe the rights of citizens in a free society, but it is a hollow claim. When the second amendment was drafted this country was largely unsettled wilderness and for many a gun was as necessary as is a refrigerator today. Our crowded urban civilization can no longer tolerate the indiscriminate proliferation of firearms to satisfy the whims of gun fanciers.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, August 1 marked the third anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army Materiel Command. The function of this Command is to perform the basic logistics mission of the Army, including research, development, procurement, production, supply and maintenance. This is a large job and

August 4, 1965

18692

it has been done well. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a more thorough description of the Command's activities to date.

Accelerated response to the Army's need for better weapons, equipment and supplies has become the hallmark of the U.S. Army Materiel Command. New levels of effectiveness and economy have been reached from research and development through procurement and distribution, and streamlining and improving both in-house operations and relationships with American science and industry.

In terms of the Department of Defense cost reduction program, AMC's dollar savings have far exceeded its established goal for the third successive year. Although final figures have not been compiled, Gen. Frank S. Besson, Jr., commanding general of AMC, estimates that AMC will show a savings of more than \$500 million during fiscal year 1965 against a goal of \$433,330,000.

During fiscal year 1965 AMC total military and civilian manpower decreased 5 percent from 172,500 to 163,000. From an original of 278 local and regional facilities taken over from the Army's Technical Services in 1962, AMC has reduced its nationwide network of installations and activities to 191.

Approximately 800 individual organizational consolidations were accomplished during fiscal year 1965 to reduce installation support costs. These actions ranged from unifying of maintenance operations on a single installation to the placing of two or more installations under a single management.

AMC's ability to react quickly and effectively was put to a test, when U.S. troops were dispatched to the Dominican Republic. Initial weapons and equipment support for U.S. troops was accomplished through AMC's automatic supply support machinery, based upon predetermined requirements for type and size of the force involved. This automatic support was rated effective in all respects.

Experience in Vietnam and the recent approval of the Army's first Airmobile Division have given a new sense of urgency to AMC's development of new Army aircraft and aircraft support. In addition to a continuous program to adapt and improve existing aircraft and equipment to meet requirements in Vietnam, AMC has stepped up its research development and procurement activities over the past 12 months to meet the Army's overall air support needs.

Among major aircraft actions during fiscal year 1965 was the initiation of multiyear procurement of a new light observation helicopter. Other aircraft achievements have included two XV-5A vertical short takeoff and landing lift-fan research aircraft evaluation; first flight test of the XV-9A experimental hot cycle helicopter, and other aircraft with increased weapon loads to serve as escorts for transport helicopters. Other action was taken on both land and sea to increase our advantage militarily in Vietnam.

In addition to supplying U.S. forces at home and abroad, AMC furnished support to 80 nation and international or-

ganizations under the international logistics programs. The AMC has helped with coproduction in both Italy and Germany. They have sent to these countries both tanks and armored personal carriers, resulting in aid abroad and industrial production at home.

The AMC this year established the Army industrial material information liaison office program—AIMILO—to increase competition for the Army's procurement dollar through providing industry with long-range advance planning procurement information—APPI—on future Army military needs.

AMC's continuing drive to improve the quality and reliability of Army weapons and equipment was highlighted over the past year by the widespread application of the zero defects concept, a program designed to motivate all personnel, from executive to shop workers, to be more quality conscious.

Other significant actions during AMC's third year as the Army's consolidated source of supplies and equipment include:

Development of a lightweight—44 pounds—atomic clock which measures time down to a ten-billionth of a second, used for setting frequencies on radios, tracking of missiles and satellites, and synchronization of radars.

Development of a Morse code reader, the size of a cigarette pack, that plugs into an Army radio and makes Morse code as easy to read as an electric signboard.

Completion of scheduled overseas deployment of new family on FM radios, four general purpose vehicles, and the Sergeant, Pershing, and Hawk missiles.

In an anniversary message to AMC personnel, General Besson, who has headed AMC since its inception in 1962, cogently summed up the aims and accomplishments of the Army Materiel Command:

Our support for the soldier in the field—from Korea to Berlin, from the Dominican Republic to Vietnam—is on schedule. The weapons, equipment, and supplies we are providing are worthy of the men who use them. This is no time, however, to rest upon our laurels. As the pace quickens, the mounting demands upon our skills and experience must be met by each of us with determination, dedication, and with a real sense of urgency.

THROWING AWAY EXPORT MARKETS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the commercial news service Comtel, a subsidiary of Reuters, the English news service with a bureau here in Washington, carried a story on Tuesday, August 3, that a Russian trade delegation has arrived in Canada to study two-way trade with the Canadians.

Significantly, the eight-man delegation headed by the Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade, includes top Russian wheat experts and the itinerary of the party includes Montreal, Winnipeg, and other Canadian wheat centers.

The party is said to be studying all aspects of trade with Canada but it is obvious that the central concern is wheat. The Russians are in the market for a

continuing supply of wheat, as our own Foreign Agricultural Service indicated some time ago. Their experts, like ours, see clearly that there will be the continuing necessity for a number of years for Russia and the Eastern bloc nations to buy wheat by the millions of tons.

The Russian trade mission is in Canada, with no plan to come to the United States which has an 800 million bushel wheat stock on hand, millions of idle wheat acres, and economically depressed wheat producers. They will ignore American wheat stocks because if they seek to buy wheat in this country they will be confronted with shipping requirements and excess shipping charges which make the product of our farmers as much as 10, 11, 12, and even 15 cents per bushel more expensive than Canadian wheat.

In the wheat marketing year which closed about July 1, Russia and Eastern European nations purchased from Canada, Argentina, Australia, and France an estimated 5.6 million tons of wheat, or better than 200 million bushels, worth nearly \$350 million.

The United States did not get any of this business for the same reason that the Russians are now bypassing us: an administration ruling in 1963, that 50 percent of any wheat sold to Soviet bloc countries, even though sold for cash on normal commercial terms, must be moved in American ships.

U.S. shipping charges are considerably above world shipping rates because our higher standard of living calls for higher wages for our maritime workers.

Shipping rates on wheat from the Gulf of Mexico to Black Sea ports is \$18 per ton on American vessels and \$9.25 per ton of foreign vessels. This amounts to 48 cents per bushel on U.S.-flag vessels and 25 cents per bushel on foreign ships—a difference of 23 cents per bushel.

This means that on a large cargo, shipped 50 percent in American bottoms, U.S. wheat would cost the Russians or Eastern European importers 11½ to 12 cents per bushel more than Canadian or other competitors' wheat. This is in a market on which fractions of a cent per bushel determines the sale. One cent per bushel on the Eastern bloc's purchases last year would have amounted to \$1.5 million. An 11 cent differential would have meant a difference of \$16.5 million.

The Export Control Act to which this 50-percent American shipping ruling has been administratively attached actually provides that no restrictions can be put on the ordinary commercial sale of American agricultural commodities except for security or foreign policy reasons. Yet, a determination was made in 1963 that it was in our national interest to make wheat sales to Russia.

The fact is that the shipping restriction was concocted for domestic political reasons and is one of the most irrational, self-defeating regulations ever devised. It results in our farmers losing an export market for at least \$100 million worth of wheat annually, and a loss of that much in our balance-of-payments effort. At the same time, it does nothing to